THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

So long as men have hearts to feel what Virgil called 'the tears of things' they will read the Book of Job to see if in it they can find any comfort when life is an agonizing thing. And so long as men have minds to appreciate beauty, they will read the Book of Job, because it is one of the world's great monuments of literature.

The Book of Job and Its Meaning,[1] by Professor H. H. Rowley, M.A., D.D., Theol.D., F.B.A., is an admirably proportioned monograph on the Book of Job, in which the critical problems of the book and the religious value of the book are briefly but illuminatingly treated.

Carlyle called Job 'one of the grandest things ever written with pen', and held that there was nothing in the Bible or out of the Bible to equal it as literature. Froude described Job as 'towering up alone, far away above all the poetry of the world'. C. F. Kent called Job 'The Matterhorn of the Old Testament'. But it may be that Buttenweiser's verdict is truest of all. As he sees it, the greatness of Job lies in the fact that of all ancient masterpieces of literature Job is felt to be most modern. The problem of Job is still a contemporary problem.

Dr. Rowley deals with certain critical problems which attach to Job. It is useless to try to classify Job as epic or drama. It is *sui generis*. The Prologue and the Epilogue have been much discussed. It has been argued that they are *earlier* than the dialogue, and that the dialogue has been made to fit them; that they are *later* than the dialogue; and that they are the work of a completely different hand. Dr. Rowley believes them to be integral to the book. Without the Prologue the book would be a torso; it would have no setting. It is true that the dialogue betrays no knowledge of the Prologue, but the whole point of the whole Book of Job is that the actors in it do not know what happened in the events of the Prologue; if they did, there would be no problem. As for the Epilogue, without it the book would be unfinished. 'A human court which left a defendant to languish in gaol after a verdict of acquittal would be denounced as unjust. Job was acquitted, and therefore he must be delivered from his misfortunes, since they are the form his trial takes.'

There is a further critical problem in the speeches of Elihu. Dr. Rowley does not think that they are part of the original book. Their style—S. R. Driver called it 'prolix, laboured, and sometimes tautologous'—is different. It is even more serious that their solution to the problem is not the solution of the whole book, for Elihu's solution is that 'suffering is disciplinary, to purge the heart of pride, which was Job's sin'. The speeches of Elihu can be removed without disturbing the structure of the book. Dr. Rowley believes that at least the first speech of Jahweh is integral to the book, although the second may not be. He believes that the poem on wisdom in ch. 28 is a magnificent poem, but not part of the book. And he believes that the third cycle of the speeches may have suffered loss and dislocation. The date he believes to be post-Exilic, probably about 400 B.C.

But the great interest of Dr. Rowley's book lies in his investigation into the purpose of Job. Some writers have supposed that the purpose of the book is to solve the problem of suffering. That it certainly does not do. The only 'solution' of that problem is in the speeches of Elihu. Their solution is that suffering is disciplinary; and very certainly that is not the view with which the Prologue sets out. Others have felt that the object of the book was 'to overthrow the view that all suffering was self-entailed and that rigid justice was done in human affairs'. It is argued that that in fact is the view of the Old Testament—that sin and suffering go hand in hand. But surely no one would hold that Abel, Uriah, Naboth 'got what they deserved'. It is argued that both Ezekiel and Jeremiah taught that individual sin is followed by individual suffering. But it is quite impossible that Jeremiah should have held that in the light of his own career.

[1] Reprinted from the 'Bulletin of the John Rylands Library', XLI. i. [September, 1958] (Manchester University Press; 3s. 6d. net).

When Jeremiah denies the doctrine that the children suffer for the sins of the fathers, and lays it down that 'Every one shall die for his own iniquity' (Jer 31^{30}) he no more means that every one in this world gets what he deserves than the New Testament does when it says, 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap' (Gal 6^{7}). Neither of these two sayings eliminates the possibility of innocent suffering. What may well have happened is that the insistence of Deuteronomy that national loyalty means national prosperity and national disloyalty means national disaster, coupled with the greater emphasis on the individual in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, may have produced the 'wooden view' held by Job's friends that 'a man's experience reflected his character'. But it cannot ever be held that the Old Testament as a whole teaches that all suffering is due to sin.

What, then, does Job teach? The writer is 'concerned less with theology than religion'. To the end he suffers in the dark—that is why he has a message for others who have to bear the same. 'When one is suffering, it may be good to understand the cause; but it is better to be sustained to endure.' It must be noted that Job was suffering to vindicate more than himself. 'He was vindicating God's trust in him. He was not so much abandoned by God as supremely honoured by God.' The cause for suffering is 'hidden in the heart of God'. If a man remembers Job, he may see that, even if he does not understand why he suffers, he may still face his suffering in the trust that, 'if he could know the cause, he too might find that he was serving God and honouring God in his very agony'.

But the great lesson of Job is this. If suffering is the result of sin, then suffering necessarily separates a man from God, because sin separates a man from God. Now Job's great discovery is that even ununderstood suffering and agony need not separate a man from God, and can in fact bring him nearer to God. This does not explain suffering, but it does mean that 'it may be turned to spiritual profit, if he finds God in it'. Dr. Rowley denies that a firm and settled belief in an after-life really affects the problem, because, although an after-life might bring its compensations for suffering, it still does not in the least give any explanation of present suffering. So in the end it may be said that Job teaches that there is such a thing as innocent suffering, that God has His explanation although man may never find any explanation, that suffering need not separate from God, but can in fact enrich life by bringing the sufferer nearer to God.

It remains to be said that in the magnificent and spacious footnotes of this monograph the whole literature on Job is to be found. Only a scholar of Dr. Rowley's erudition could have produced these footnotes, and only one to whom religion is as dear as scholarship could have written the whole book.

World history seems to be converging towards a single final issue—Christ or Antichrist, and Antichrist is not simply evil in general, but rather the concretion of the powers of evil in the form of an alternative to the true universal salvation offered to the world in Jesus Christ. Such is the main thesis which is persuasively argued by Bishop Lesslie Newbigin in a recent paper, entitled 'The Summons to Christian Mission To-day'.[1]

This distinguished missionary statesman is in no doubt that we may now speak of the appearance of a single world civilization and therefore of a single world history. This has its obvious outward signs such as the emergence in every part of the world of modern techniques of production, transport and communication based on modern methods of business organization and finance. Deeper than that, however, is the fact that the Western Christian tradition has made such an impact on lands dominated by the ancient Eastern faiths that convictions have now been bred in the popular mind there which had no place in the tradition of these lands. It has, for instance, become part of the thinking of the most illiterate Asian peasant that it is the duty of his Government to initiate plans for raising the national wealth so that the maximum possible security, health and happiness shall be the lot of every citizen. A single world civilization means more than simply the universal spread of technics as a means of doing desirable things more efficiently: it means also the universalizing of a whole body of thought and practice inspired by the belief that man can master Nature and history and use his powers to create for himself a better world.

How revolutionary this is becomes apparent when one recalls that the ancient Eastern faiths regard history as a process which constantly returns on itself rather than as a forward movement towards a goal. In our day, however, the linear conception of history derived from the Western Christian tradition has become part of the thinking of ordinary folk even in the lands of the East. Moreover a single world civilization

[1] *The International Review of Missions*, xlviii. [April, 1959].

means that there is a single world history. Those who do not believe that human affairs are leading to any significant goal can hardly have the idea of history at all, while those who judge events solely in terms of their own people in relation to neighbouring peoples can only have a kind of tribal history; but, when peoples begin to have a belief as to the direction in which mankind as a whole is moving, world history comes on the scene, and that is what is happening for multitudes in the world to-day. Not only are more and more peoples using a calendar in which events are reckoned on a linear time-scale which dates from the birth of Christ, but there appears to be a certain appropriateness in that dating, for the force which is drawing peoples out of their separation into a common world history is a secularized and distorted form of the Christian eschatology, a this-worldly faith which finds the significance of human life in the future achievement of a new order of human society on earth.

The tragic element in our present situation is that this secularized and distorted Christian eschatology is penetrating to every corner of the earth just at a time when its credit has been sapped in the lands of its origin by the working out of its own logic. How that has come about is not difficult to see. If this world is all and if the significance of human history lies in the achievement of a golden age which all previous generations are never to enjoy, then we and all our predecessors are means not ends; and presumably if we prove inefficient means or even hindrances to the great end there can be no objection to our immediate liquidation. The logic of this faith thus leads to the worst practices of the totalitarian states and to a sense of the significance of history as a whole which is achieved at the cost of abandoning all significance for the individual.

For men to become convinced, however, that this secularized Christian eschatology is unsatisfactory does not in practice mean that they revert to the true Christian eschatology. Some react into a cynical pursuit of momentary satisfactions, giving up the attempt to make sense of life as a whole. Others turn to religion in the form of an individualistic pietism which stresses the inner spiritual history of the individual and his personal immortality but abandons the scheme of things as a whole to incoherence. Thus some significance for the history of the individual is achieved at the cost of giving up any possibility of meaning for history as a whole.

As Bishop NEWBIGIN sees it, the real alternative to Christ, the Saviour of the world, is the Antichrist, whether in an Eastern or a Western guise, who claims to bring mankind final security and well-being in terms of this world and this side of death. The Christian faith gives meaning to the history of mankind as a whole and to the history of each individual person when it declares that the Kingdom of God, which broke into human history in the coming of Jesus Christ, will be finally sovereign over all, even sin and death being conquered in a new order of being of which the resurrection of Jesus Christ is the first-fruit. The modern secularized form of the faith has substituted for the hope of God's Kingdom transcending history the hope of a new order within history, a new order to be achieved by man himself as he learns to master Nature including himself.

When the situation is seen in this light the world mission of the Church and the unity of the Church stand forth as central clues for the understanding of world history. The true gospel must be brought to all mankind, and a universal gospel demands as its sign and instrument a universal Christian fellowship. In the face of Antichrist all churchmanship must become missionary, going into all the world, and all churchmanship must become ecumenical, glorying in the Name of Christ alone and letting all those other names which we have added to the one Name fall into a secondary place. It is therefore in these terms that this clear-sighted churchman sums up—'We face an increasingly unified world whose central driving conception is a secularized and distorted form of the Christian eschatology—a faith in the ultimate power of man to establish on earth the order that he wants. To that we have to oppose simply the word of the gospel—not an ideology, not a programme, not a religion, but simply Jesus Christ, crucified, risen and ascended, the lowly Servant of all men and the exalted King and Head of the whole human race. We have only one message, and only one authority for delivering it; our message and our authority is Jesus Christ. That is the one Name given under heaven for the salvation of mankind. It is enough that we stand under that Name.'

PRINTING DISPUTE

The Editors greatly regret the inconvenience caused to readers by the delayed issue of this number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES owing to the protracted printing dispute. Everything possible is being done to bring out the September number quickly.

The Gospel of Thomas

By the Reverend R. McLachlan Wilson, B.D., Ph.D., St. Mary's College, St. Andrews

The Gospel of Thomas, discovered in Egypt in 1946, has recently received a certain amount of attention in the daily press, as indeed is but natural in view of the interest and importance of the document. Unfortunately some of the reports have not been entirely accurate. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that this is not a 'fifth Gospel', and cannot stand comparison with the canonical four. It adds nothing to our knowledge of the life and work of Jesus, or of His death and resurrection. It is in fact nothing more or less than a collection of sayings, over a hundred in number, and the character of some of them is enough to explain its exclusion from the Canon. This does not, however, detract from the importance of the discovery. The new text can neither supplement nor supplant the canonical Gospels as sources for the life and ministry of Jesus; what it does do is to provide us with a sayings-tradition alongside that of the canonical Gospels, but apparently distinct from, and possibly independent of, the canonical tradition. Hitherto we have had to draw our knowledge of the growth and development of the gospel tradition from a comparison of parallel passages within our Gospels. Now we have parallels to many gospel sayings in a collection handed down within a heretical sect. The study of these sayings in relation to their canonical parallels cannot but add to our knowledge of the development of the gospel tradition and of the way in which the words of Jesus were understood and interpreted in certain circles of the Early Church.

The projected official edition has not yet made its appearance, but a number of articles on the subject are already in print. Professor J. Leipoldt published a German translation in July, 1958, and Professor H. C. Puech includes translations of some sayings in the account of the document which he has contributed to the recently-published third edition of Hennecke's *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*. The latest and most complete account in English is an article by Dr. W. C. Till in *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*. Now from the pen of M. Jean Doresse, one of the first scholars to see the Nag Hammadi texts, comes a French translation with an extensive Introduction and detailed notes.[1]

Comparison of the translations offered shows that there is broad agreement in regard to the rendering of most of the text, but there are some variations. The manuscript, of course, has no punctuation, and occasionally words or phrases taken by one scholar with what precedes are taken by another with the words which follow. Again, some passages are so obscure as to leave scope for considerable difference of opinion as to their meaning, and the difficulties are increased by the fact that each *logion* is an independent unit, so that the clues normally afforded by the context are here entirely lacking. A further point of difference is that where Puech and Till use the official numbering of the sayings (a hundred and fourteen in all), Leipoldt counts a hundred and twelve and Doresse a hundred and eighteen. Admittedly it is often difficult to determine where a new *logion* begins (the introductory formula 'Jesus said', or its equivalent, is not always present), but this variation certainly does not make for ease of comparison.

As to date, Doresse would put the manuscript as written about the middle or end of the fourth century. Till notes divergent opinions, ranging from the third century to about 500, and gives his own guess as 'about 400'. More important is the date at which the collection was made, and here there seems to be general agreement that the 'Gospel' was compiled at latest at the beginning of the third century. Leipoldt here makes the point that if 'Thomas' used our Synoptics we should be able to explain the variations, which in many cases is impossible; we have therefore to do with an independent tradition, and this must go back to a period before the Synoptics attained canonical recognition. The *Grundstock* of 'Thomas' must therefore go back before A.D. 200. It should be added that Puech defers decision, pending the completion of detailed study, as to whether 'Thomas' is later than our Gospels,

[1] Leipoldt, in *TLZ* [1958], 481 ff.; Puech, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, I: *Evangelien* [Tübingen, 1959], 199 ff. (See also *ib.*, 61 ff. [Schneemelcher and Jeremias] for the Oxyrhynchus Papyri); Till, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xli. [1959], 446 ff.; Doresse, *Les Paroles de Jésus* [Paris, 1959]. Further references to literature in *New Testament Studies*, v. [1959], 273 ff., and Prigent, in *Rev. Hist. et Phil. Rel.*, xxxix. [1959], 39 ff. On the library of Nag Hammadi as a whole, see most recently *Scottish Journal of Theology*, xii. [1959], 161 ff.

or derived from the same source (and perhaps reflecting it more accurately), or represents a parallel tradition.

Some of these sayings are more or less identical with their canonical parallels, for example, ' Blessed are the poor, for yours is the kingdom of heaven ' (cf. Lk 6^{20}). Others show modifications or expansions of the familiar sayings, for example, ' A man cannot ride two horses, or draw two bows. A servant cannot serve two masters ; or he will honour the one and insult the other ' (cf. Mt 6^{24}, etc.). ' He who has, to him shall it be given. But he who has not, even the little that he has will be taken from him ' (cf. Mt 13^{12}). The Parable of the Great Supper (Lk 14^{16ff}) appears in a different version, with four guests and completely different excuses. Such a passage may possibly provide an example of ' hellenization ' of the tradition actually in process, a parable passing from its original village and pastoral background to an urban and commercial environment.

Another kind of development may perhaps be seen in the saying ' A prophet is not accepted in his own town ; a doctor does not heal those who know him '. As Doresse notes, the saying ' A prophet is not without honour . . . ' occurs in all four Gospels, but the substance of the *logion* in ' Thomas ' is most closely paralleled in Luke (4^{24}), where the preceding verse cites a proverb about a doctor. Yet another saying seems to show 1 Co 2^{9} growing into a word of Jesus : ' I will give you that which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hand touched, nor hath entered into the heart of man '. This is the less surprising, in that the New Testament itself supplies at least one example of the same process (cf. Mk 1^{8}, Ac 1^{5}). At a later date Irenaeus quotes from Papias a passage ascribing to Jesus part of the Apocalypse of Baruch, and this again seems to underlie a Coptic homily (quoted by Doresse, p. 150) attributed to John Chrysostom.

Other sayings appear in terser form than in our Gospels, for example, ' There was a rich man who had great possessions. He said, I will use my possessions, to sow and reap and plant, that I may fill my barns, so that I may need nothing. Such were the thoughts of his heart, but in that night he died. He that hath ears, let him hear ' (cf. Lk 12^{16ff}). The Parable of the Sower, again, has in some respects, as Professor Quispel has observed, a very primitive ring. A special interest here attaches to the fact that in Thomas the first seed falls not by the wayside but *on* the road.

The sayings so far quoted might in themselves be regarded as based upon their canonical parallels, either by expansion or by reduction. This conclusion seems however to be ruled out when we examine the collection as a whole. If ' Thomas ' derived his material from our Gospels, why did he distort the order ? On every page sayings from different parts of the Gospels are brought together and mingled with sayings from other sources without, it seems, either rhyme or reason. It may be possible in time to isolate different strata, to discover a *Grundschrift* based on some coherent principle, but we must beware of imposing our own patterns upon the material. As Professor Henry Chadwick has reminded us in his edition of *The Sentences of Sextus*, such collections tend to take on something of the character of a snowball. And the Gospel of Thomas certainly grew with the passing of the years. Some passages have been identified in patristic quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the Gospel of the Egyptians, for others parallels have been found (if they are not quotations) in a wide range of literature from Manicheism to the Middle Ages. A few are Jewish-Christian, others clearly Gnostic, although the Gnosticism is not pronounced. Puech believes there were at least two versions, of which one was read by orthodox Christians down to the fifth or sixth century, while the other was current in Gnostic and Manichean circles. Part of the work is extant in Greek in the famous *Logia* from Oxyrhynchus, and Doresse observes that the Coptic version contains some gnosticizing traits which are absent from the Greek—which suggests a hasty redaction intended to adapt the primitive text to Gnostic use.

One other point may be noted : the three verses, Lk $5^{39.\ 37.\ 36}$, appear together and in that order, and the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen (Mk 12^{1-9}) is immediately followed by a saying about a rejected stone (cf. Mk 12^{10}). Are these no more than modifications of the Synoptic parallels, or do they perhaps point to a stage of development when such material was only beginning to be grouped together ?

Much more might be written, many other problems discussed, but limits of space forbid. It must suffice to refer to the published studies and the projected edition, and to welcome the discovery of a document which, if in its present form it may be comparatively late and the result of gnosticizing adaptation, may yet preserve in no small measure evidence of a tradition which goes back to an early stage in the history of the Church.

Great Themes of the New Testament

VI. Matthew xxiv.

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

Matthew 24, with its parallels in Mk 13 and Lk 21, is a passage which has always exercised a fascination over the minds of students of the New Testament. The conservative critic would no doubt accept it entirely as the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus. Montefiore dismisses it as unauthentic and even unedifying. Scholars such as Moffatt, McNeile, Rawlinson and Branscombe see in it in one form or another a Jewish-Christian apocalypse. The commonest form of this view is to see in it a Christian document built up by Mark on the basis of a 'fly leaf' issued by some Christian prophet, speaking in the name of Jesus, in the dreadful days which preceded the last siege and the final fall of Jerusalem. Vincent Taylor sees in it a document, containing embedded in it original sayings of Jesus, which have been adapted to the doctrinal and catechetical needs of the Church at the time when Mark wrote. In a study such as this it is unnecessary to discuss these various points of view. The one thing of which we can be sure is that this chapter contains the views of the future which the Apostolic Church held, and must thus go back to what they believed that Jesus had said.

There is no doubt whatever that the chapter contains sayings about different future events. The intermingling of subjects can be seen at the very beginning of the passage in the different ways in which the question of the disciples to Jesus is phrased. Jesus and His disciples were leaving the Temple courts. The disciples commented on the size and the magnificence of the stones in the building—and well they might. Josephus tells us of stones forty feet long, by twelve feet high, by eighteen feet wide, and of columns which the united arms of three men could scarcely span (Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, XV. xi. 3–5). Jesus' answer was that the day would come when not one of these great stones would be left upon another, and when the whole building would be totally destroyed (Mt 24^{2}, Mk $13^{1.2}$, Lk $21^{5.6}$). So far the story is related in all three Gospels in the same way. Then comes the divergence. Both Mark and Luke then go on to say that the disciples asked Jesus when these things would happen (Mk 13^{4}, Lk 21^{7}); but Matthew adds something: 'When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?' (Mt 24^{3}). Matthew has turned an *historical* question into an *eschatological* question. This is in any event characteristic of Matthew; but it does mean that we are already warned that in what follows we are going to find two strands of material—one which deals with the historical future, and one which deals with the eschatological future.

1. Let us, then, disentangle the first strand of the material, the strand which deals with the coming destruction of Jerusalem within history. We find that material in Mt 24^{15-22}, Mk 13^{14-20}, Lk 21^{20-24}; (cf. Lk $19^{42.43}$). There is not the slightest doubt that Jesus, speaking as a prophet, foretold the destruction of Jerusalem. This material stands out with unmistakable clarity; this section clearly deals not with the Second Coming and not with the eschatological events but with the final siege and the ultimate fall of Jerusalem.

Everything that Jesus said was abundantly fulfilled. That time would begin with the abomination of desolation, the desolating sacrilege, standing in the Holy Place (Mt 24^{15}, Mk 13^{14}; the phrase is absent from Luke). The origin of the phrase is clear, although the precise meaning of it remains in doubt. The phrase comes from Daniel (9^{27} 11^{31} 12^{11}). It describes the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes in 168 to 165 B.C. The writer of 1 Maccabees says: 'Now the fifteenth day of the month Casleu, in the hundred and forty-fifth year, they set up the abomination of desolation upon the altar, and builded idol altars through the cities of Juda on every side' (1 Mac 1^{54}). The erection of the altar to Olympian Zeus, the offering of swine's flesh, the complete desecration of the Temple are all included in the phrase. In the year A.D.40 history was within an ace of repeating itself, for it was in that year that the mad Roman Emperor Caligula decided to introduce his own statue into the Holy of Holies, a blasphemous project which was halted by his death in the following year. It is not necessary to define strictly what the desolating sacrifice here is. It is certain that Jewish thought looked forward to the invasion of earth by a supra-mundane incarnation of evil; just as there was a divine Messiah, so there would be a devilish Messiah. Such a figure appears as the Man of Sin

in 2 Th 2^3; as devilish symbolic figures of Rome in Rev 17; as the antichrist in 1 Jn 4^3. It is enough to see that Jesus is saying that the terrible history of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes will repeat itself, but in an even more ultimate form, and that the incarnation and the quintessence of evil will desecrate, despoil and destroy the Temple.

At such a time they are to flee to the mountains with such haste that they do not even wait to pick up their essential baggage. That is precisely what the people did not do when the last terrible time came; they crowded into the city with consequences which were disastrous. The final siege and fall of Jerusalem form one of the most terrible stories in all history. Josephus says that ninety-seven thousand were taken captive, and eleven hundred thousand perished by the sword and by slow starvation. Josephus describes the famine of the siege: 'Then did the famine widen its progress, and devoured the people by whole houses and families; the upper rooms were full of women and children that were dying of famine; and the lanes of the cities were full of the dead bodies of the aged; the children also and the young men wandered about the marketplaces like shadows, all swelled with famine, and fell down dead wheresoever their misery seized them. As for burying them, those that were sick themselves were not able to do it; and those that were hearty and well were deterred from doing it by the great multitude of these dead bodies, and by the uncertainty there was how soon they would die themselves, for many died as they were burying others, and many went to their coffins before the fatal hour was come. Nor was there any lamentation made under these calamities, nor were heard any mournful complaints; but the famine confounded all natural passions; for those who were just going to die looked on those who were gone to their rest before them with dry eyes and open mouths. A deep silence also and a kind of deadly night had seized upon the city . . . and everyone of them died with their eyes fixed upon the Temple' (Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, V. xii. 3). Josephus tells a dreadful story of a woman who in those days killed, roasted and ate her suckling child (*ib.*, VI. iii. 4). He tells that even the Romans, when they entered the city, were so horror-stricken by its sights, that they could not plunder it. 'When the Romans were come to the houses to plunder them, they found in them entire families of dead men, and the upper rooms full of dead corpses. . . . They then stood on a horror of this sight, and went out without touching anything' (*ib.*, VI. viii. 5). Jesus also was a prophet who warned men of the disaster to come.

They are to hope and pray that the time for flight will not be in the winter-time; it will be a time of agony for those who have little children to care for. And they are to pray that the time for flight will not come on the Sabbath (Mt 24^{20}). The point of this curious phrase is this. Time and time again the Jews had suffered terribly rather than break the Sabbath Law, which forbade all activity on the Sabbath days. In the early days of the Maccabaean revolt a company of Jews who had taken refuge in caves were wiped out without lifting a hand to defend themselves because it was the Sabbath day (Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, XII. vi. 2). During his siege of the city, Pompey was able to erect a mound from which to menace the defenders, because the Jewish defenders would not lift a hand to stop the builders of the mound on the Sabbath day (Josephus, *Wars of the Jews*, I. vii. 3). A rigidly orthodox Jew became helpless even to defend himself on the Sabbath day, although there was general agreement among the less extreme that even on the Sabbath day defensive action might be taken.

There is, then, in this chapter one strand of material which deals with the fall of Jerusalem. Walking in the succession of the prophets who could tell where the trends of history were moving, Jesus saw that the intransigence of the Jews could have no other end than their total destruction —and that destruction came.

2. Before we leave the strands of this passage which deal with history within time, we may note that it also contains the prediction of persecution (Mt 24^9). The Christians are to be delivered up to be afflicted and to be killed, and are to be universally hated for the sake of the name of Jesus. Luke and Mark (Lk 21^{12-20}, Mk 13^{9-13}) add to this material which Matthew has in 10^{17-22} which tells how the Holy Spirit will tell them what to say in the hour of need, and how even the members of the same family will turn against each other, and will betray each other.

Once again, this prophecy was abundantly fulfilled. The Christians were savagely hated. H. B. Workman (*Persecution in the Early Church*, 189, 190 footnote) collects a series of heathen verdicts on Christianity. Tacitus called it a deadly superstition (*exitiablis superstitio*; *Annals*, xv. 44); Suetonius (*Nero*, 16) a new and pernicious superstition (*superstitio nova et malefica*); Pliny (*Epistles*, x. 96) a depraved and extravagant superstition (*superstitio prava et immodica*). Marcus Aurelius spoke of 'the sheer obstinacy' of the Christians (*Meditations*, ii. 3). Tertullian quotes the verdict that the Christians were 'public enemies' (*publici hostes*; *Apology*, 35). In the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix (here Workman's references require correction) Caecilius calls

Christianity 'a vain and mad superstition' (*vana et demens superstitio* [ix. 3]); 'an unlawful and desperate faction' (*inlicitae ac desperatae factionis* [viii. 3]); he calls the Christian meetings 'abominable shrines of an impious assembly' (*sacraria taeterrima impiae coitionis* [ix. 1]); he declares Christianity to be 'a confederacy to be rooted out and detested' (*eruenda et execranda consensio* [ix. 1]); and he speaks of the Christians as 'a people lurking in dens and darkness' (*latebrosa et lucifuga natio* [viii. 4]).

There is no question of the hatred. The main cause of that hatred is to be seen in the other threat which hung over the Christians. They were to be hated and betrayed by even their own family. The heathen might accuse the Christians of cannibalism and immorality in the Sacrament and in the Love Feast; the Roman Government might charge the Christians with revolutionary tendencies because they would not say: 'Caesar is Lord'; but the supreme cause of heathen hatred was in fact the effect of Christianity upon family life. 'Tampering with family relationships' (1 $P4^{15}$) was a charge which was early made against the Christians. There were occasions when it was bitterly true that Jesus had come to send within the family, not peace, but a sword (Mt $10^{34.35}$). Justin Martyr (*Second Apology*, 2) tells of a woman who became a Christian, and who determined to reform her own life and the life of her heathen husband.The husband remained stubbornly set in his heathen ways and in his heathen morals. The woman, therefore, determined to obtain a divorce. The revenge of the husband was immediately to denounce her and her teacher Ptolemy as Christians. Literally, the wife was handed over by the husband.

By the second century the Christians themselves were not altogether blameless, and to some extent at least brought persecution upon themselves. There were those of them who took literally the injunction to call no man 'father' (Mt 23^{9}). Workman points out that in Gaul at least Christian inscriptions rarely mention parentage. Lucian of Antioch was asked by the Judge of what parents he was, and he answered: 'A Christian's only relatives are the saints'. Sometimes the Christians deliberately destroyed the family ties. Further, there came an increasing and mistaken emphasis on virginity and on so-called 'chastity'. In the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* (ii.) Demas describes Paul's influence: 'He deprives young men of wives and maidens of husbands by saying that in no other way shall there be a resurrection for you save by remaining chaste and keeping the flesh chaste'. In Ruinart's *Acts of the Martyrs* (27th April, 304) we read of the trial of Pollio, a reader. The Judge describes the Christians: 'You mean those people who impose on silly women and tell them that they must not marry, and persuade them to adopt a fanciful chastity'.

The day indeed came when the Christians—sometimes inevitably, and sometimes through their own unwisdom—were hated of all men for the sake of the name of Jesus Christ.

3. There is one other strand of this chapter which falls at least partly within history. It predicts the coming of false Messiahs, pretending Christs, and deceiving teachers. This strand is to be found in Mt $24^{4.5.11.12.23-26}$ (cf. Mk $13^{5.6.21.22}$, Lk 17^{23} $21^{8.9}$). Once again Jesus' prophetic insight was profoundly right. It was the coming of a false Messiah which added the last terrible touches to the destruction of Jerusalem and indeed to the desolation of the whole of Judaea in the years 132 to 135.

At that time Hadrian was Emperor. He had a passion for rebuilding and for restoration. He, therefore, planned to rebuild the shattered Jerusalem. But he did not intend to rebuild it for the Jews; it was to become Aelia Capitolina, a Roman city, with the shrines of Jupiter and Venus in it, and an edict was to be passed making circumcision illegal on the grounds that it was mutilation. Not only in Palestine, but all over the world the Jews were roused to fury. In Palestine there emerged a strange figure called Bar-Kokheba. The name means Son of the Star, and it is founded on the prophecy in Nu 24^{17}. It may be that Bar-Kokheba was almost forced into his Messianic claims. The greatest Jewish Rabbi of the time was Akiba. He was so much a friend of the people that he was called 'The Hand of the Poor'. He was so great an expert in, and expounder of, the Law that he was regarded as a second Ezra. He was convinced that Bar-Kokheba was indeed the Messiah, and even became his armour-bearer. At first the rebellion was successful, for the Romans had no great military forces in Palestine, but, when Hadrian saw the conflagration which had been kindled, he recalled the great soldier Sextus Julius Severus from Britain to deal with it. There followed a war to the death, a war of extermination. The Jewish dead amounted to five hundred thousand, and as W. D. Morrison puts it (*The Jews under Roman Rule*, 203) the Jewish captives 'glutted the slave markets of the East'. Palestine was devastated with such a devastation that the effect of it remained down even to the present century. The very name Judæa was blotted out and the province became Syria Palæstina. The Jews were forbidden ever to set foot on what had been Jerusalem, or even to gaze on it from afar off. Once again we see Jesus' prophetic insight and foresight. It was the work of a false Messiah, a pretending Christ,

which placed the grim coping-stone on the final devastation of Jerusalem and Judæa and on the obliteration of the Jewish nation as a nation.

It is needless to speak of the false teachers which arose within the Church, for every heresy which has troubled the faith had its rise and genesis in the early years of the Church. Jesus' vision of the future for Church and nation came true.

4. With the fourth strand in this chapter we come to a different kind of material. We come to the material which is definitely and directly eschatological. This is the material which describes the signs which will precede the end. The most notable thing about this material is that it is not specifically Christian at all; it is Jewish in its pictures and in its thoughts. The Jew looked for the coming of the Day of the Lord, the day when God would intervene directly in history, the day when this present age would be altogether destroyed, and when the new age would come. That period would be preceded by what the Jews called 'the travail of the Messiah', by events which would be the birth-pangs of the new age. This very word is used in our chapter. 'All these are the beginning of sorrows' (Mt 24^{8}, Mk 13^{8}). The phrase is *ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων* and *ὠδίναι* is the word for the pangs of birth. Both in the Old Testament and in the intertestamental literature these signs which precede the end are fully described, and certain of them occur very definitely in this chapter.

(a) There were to be wars and rumours of wars (Mt $24^{6.7}$); there was to be a disruption of international relationships; there was to be a destruction of personal relationships. This last may well be referred to in Mt 24^{10}: They 'shall betray one another and shall hate one another'.

Egyptian will fight with Egyptian, brother with brother, neighbour with neighbour, city with city, kingdom with kingdom (Is 19^{2}). A tumult from the Lord will be among them, and every man's hand will be against his neighbour (Zec 14^{13}). Brothers will fall in death with one another; a man will slay his sons and his son's sons; from dawn to sunset they will slay each other (Enoch $100^{1.2}$). There will be divisions one against another, and continual wars in Israel (Testament of Judah $22^{1.2}$). Friends will attack one another suddenly, and friend will war against friend (4 Ezr 5^{9} 6^{24}). There will be 'quakings of places, tumult of peoples, schemings of nations, confusion of leaders, disquietude of princes' (4 Ezr 9^{3}). The fullest picture is in the Apocalypse of Baruch 70^{3-8}: 'And they shall hate one another, and provoke one another to fight, and the mean shall rule over the honourable, and those of low degree shall be extolled above the famous. . . . Then shall confusion fall upon all men, and some of them shall fall in battle, and some of them shall perish in anguish, and some of them shall be destroyed by their own'. The Mishnah (Sotah, ix. 15) describes the signs of the approach of the Messiah: 'The inhabitants of a city go from district to district without finding compassion. The wisdom of the learned is hated, the godly despised, truth is absent. Boys insult old men, old men stand in the presence of children. The son depreciates the father, the daughter rebels against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. A man's enemies are his house-fellows.'

One of the signs of the end is this dreadful destruction of all personal relationships, this all-pervading hatred and war; and this finds its statement and its echo in our chapter.

(b) A standard feature of the signs of the end is cosmic upheaval, the shaking and shattering of the world as it is. We find this in Mt 24^{29} (cf. Mk 13^{25}, Lk 21^{25}). The time before the end is to be a time of darkness with no brightness, of gloominess and clouds and thick darkness (Am 5^{18-20}, Zeph 1^{15}, Jl 2^{2}). The stars will give no light, the sun will be darkened and the moon will cease to shine (Is 13^{10}). The moon will be turned into darkness and the sun into blood and the heavens and the earth will shake (Jl $2^{30.31}$ $3^{15.16}$). The stars will leave their orbits; the firmament will fall down; there will be a cataract of fire in which creation will become molten chaos; the order of the seasons and of night and day will be destroyed (Enoch 80^{4-8}; Sibylline Oracles $3^{83-89, 796-806}$; cf. Testament of Levi 4^{1}, Assumption of Moses 10^{4-6}).

One of the signs of the end is the shattered universe; and this too finds its statement and its echo in this chapter.

(c) It is possible that the preaching to all nations (Mt 24^{14}, Mk 13^{10}) also finds its origin in the apparatus of the Jewish signs which precede the end. It is quite true that often in the apocalyptic literature the Gentiles are destined for destruction or for slavery; but there is a strongly universalist strain in which all the nations are to be gathered in. All nations shall flow to the house of the Lord to learn the ways of the Lord (Is 2^{2-4}). All the ends of the earth are invited to look to the Lord and to be saved (Is 45^{20-22}). The feast of the Lord is for all nations (Is 25^{6-8}). Israel is destined to be a light to the Gentiles, God's salvation to the ends of the earth (Is 49^{6} 51^{4} 55^{5} 56^{6-8} 66^{19}). The heathen will turn and learn God's way, and will confess the emptiness of their worship and will worship the true God (Jer 3^{17} $12^{15.16}$ 16^{19-21}). Men of all countries and languages will learn from the Jews the way of God (Zec 14^{9}). The Son of Man will be a light to the Gentiles (Enoch $48^{4.5}$). The Gentiles will be multiplied in knowledge and

enlightened through the grace of the Lord and sin will come to an end (Testament of Levi 18^{5-9}). Nations shall come flocking to Jerusalem from the ends of the earth to find God (Psalms of Solomon 17^{34}, Sibylline Oracles $3^{710-723}$).

It is easy to stress the particularist Jewish attitude of hostility to the Gentiles; but there is a strongly universalist strand of Jewish thought; and this too may well find its echo and its statement in this chapter.

(d) Finally of these regular signs which precede the end there is the ingathering of Israel. This finds its place in our chapter in Mt 24^{31} and in Mk 13^{27}. It was the great dream that the dispersed people would be reassembled in Jerusalem. God would bring them back, those ready to perish, the outcasts and the exiles, from Assyria and Egypt and Pathros and Cush and Elam and Shinar and Hamath and the isles of the sea (Is 11^{11} $27^{12.13}$). 'O Jerusalem', says the writer of Baruch, 'look about thee toward the east, and behold the joy that cometh unto thee from God. Lo, thy sons come, whom thou sentest away, they come gathered together from the east to the west at the word of the Holy One, rejoicing in the glory of God' (Baruch $4^{36.37}$). The greatest of all the visions of the ingathering is in the Psalms of Solomon:

Stand on the height, O Jerusalem, and behold thy children,
From the East and the West, gathered together by the Lord;
From the North they come in the gladness of their God,
From the isles afar off God hath gathered them.
(Psalms of Solomon 11^{3})

Even the dead were to be raised up in order to come back.

The ingathering of the dispersed and exiled Jews was one of the dearest of Jewish dreams; and it finds its statement and its echo in our chapter.

So, then, in this chapter there are gathered together four strands of prophecy about the future—the strand which tells of the destruction of Jerusalem, the strand which tells of the persecution and the hatred to come, the strand which tells of the coming of false Messiahs and deceiving teachers, the strand which tells of the signs which precede the end, and this last strand is woven together of threads which are completely Jewish in their colour and their significance.

Contributions and Comments

Apostolic Succession Again

UNTIL it was already in print I did not know that my slight talk on 'Apostolic Succession'[1] was to appear in a series, and immediately precede the learned article by Dr. J. G. Davies.[2] If I had known this I should not indeed have altered what I wrote, but I should have taken one or two points a little further, and I am grateful to the Editor for allowing me a little extra space for expansion.

Dr. Davies was good enough to say[3] that he was in general agreement with some of my arguments. I am happy to be in agreement with some of his, and especially with his stress on the importance of the visible Church. Visibility is not the last word about the Church, but it is not a word to be ignored. It is however to his exposition of C. H. Turner's view of apostolic succession[4] that I must give attention here. I had this view in mind when I wrote,[5] 'This crude formulation of the theory of apostolic succession [the 'pipe-line' theory] is to-day often disowned but it is very hard to see what those who insist upon the succession have to put in its place'. I confess I do not find it easier after reading Dr. Davies's article. I find difficulty at the following points (and at others, which there is no space here to mention).

1. I observe that Scriptural argument ends with the first page of Dr. Davies's article, where he writes of the doctrine of the Church. As soon as he turns to the specific subject of apostolic succession, the Bible disappears. This is perhaps inevitable, but it is worth noting as a tacit admission that the succession theory is in fact independent of the Biblical doctrine of the Church and ministry. There is no space here to discuss the relation between Scripture and tradition, but those for whom *sola Scriptura* defines the ultimate authority in faith and practice cannot fail to be disturbed, not by the emergence of terms not used in Scripture—this is not necessarily significant—but by the central and essential place given to these terms.

2. A key sentence in the argument is found on pp. 229 f.: 'As Head of the Church it is Christ Himself who gives authority to His ministers; but since Christ's vicegerent on earth is the Holy Spirit and since the Holy Spirit is immanent in

[1] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES [April, 1959], 200 ff.
[2] THE EXPOSITORY TIMES [May, 1959], 228 ff.
[3] *Op. cit.*, 229.
[4] In *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry* [1918], ed. by H. B. Swete.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 200.

the Church, the authority must come through the Church ; the Church is thus the immediate medium of authorization '. This seems both logically and theologically fallacious. It would be logically sound only if it could be assumed that the Spirit could operate *only* through the Church ; it would be theologically sound only if it could be assumed that the Spirit could act *only* through an external medium. Neither of these conditions is satisfied. The Spirit is not only immanent in but also transcendent over the Church. To say this is not for a moment to deny that the Spirit is pleased to use the rites and institutions of the Church ; it is simply to safeguard the truth that as the Father is *Lord* and the Son is *Lord*, so also the Spirit is *Lord*—*τὸ κύριον καὶ ζωοποιοῦν*.

It is not surprising that Dr. Davies goes on to argue in a circle by assuming that it was under the rule of Christ and the guidance of the Spirit that episcopacy as we know it in history evolved ; and the simple reader will find it difficult to understand why it should not be ' of the first importance ' to know whether or not the apostles started the ' apostolic succession '.

3. Dr. Davies declares that ' the Church of England . . . has preserved the Apostolic Succession, although impaired ; this emphasis upon the organic nature of the Church and upon historical continuity is something of value which it has to contribute to any reunited " Church ", and to treat it as a matter of indifference is, for Anglicans, to be disloyal to their forebears in the faith and ungrateful for the inheritance which . . . has come down to them '.[6] This seems to me to admit (in its context) that the Church's history, like its present organization, is broken, anyway ; and unlike the present the past is beyond mending. Nor does this matter. The only treasure of the Church is not its ' inheritance ' (parts of which it would be well if we could forget) but Jesus Christ, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever ; and in the gospel we may have a fellowship with Augustine, Bernard, Luther, Calvin, and Wesley—and with Ignatius, Cyprian, Anselm, and Francis—which is independent of all digital succession.[7]

4. The sentence quoted in the last paragraph makes the erroneous assumption, which underlies much ecumenical conversation, that reunion will come by a common sharing of treasures. It will not. It will come, if God wills that it shall, not by the pooling of an ' impaired succession ', a bowdlerized version of Wesley's hymns, and a twentieth-century substitute for the Westminster Confession, but by revival and reformation under the Word of God.

How easily do ' gifts ' become conditions ! Wesley's comment on Ac 11^{17} is too apt to withhold from this discussion : ' And who are we, that we should withstand God ? particularly by laying down rules of Christian communion, which exclude any whom he has admitted into the church of the firstborn from worshipping God together. O that all church governors would consider how bold an usurpation this is on the authority of the supreme Lord of the Church ! O that the sin of thus withstanding God may not be laid to the charge of those who, perhaps with a good intention, but in an over-fondness for their own forms, have done it, and are continually doing it ! '

C. K. Barrett

The University
Durham

[6] *Op. cit.*, 230.

[7] Lutherans and Presbyterians, of course, will have their own comment on any exclusive claim to historical continuity and ' historical dimension '.

' He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.'—Jn xiii. 18 (Ps xli. 9)

Though there are few textual variations in the first phrase of the Johannine verse, there is general agreement as to its significance and the obvious appropriateness of the setting. ' Eating bread ' like ' eating salt '—both would have been on the table at the Last Supper—is easily understandable with the modern stories centering round the age-long Semitic custom right up to the War time experiences of Lawrence of Arabia.[1] Perhaps, however, since ' Qumrän ' and the rehabilitation of the LXX, the reading of ℵ, D and other authorities (as in the margin of the R.V. and the A.S.V.) might have been allowed to stand in the R.S.V. Is it not at least more realistic, if not more personal ? As in the eschatological banquet, presence ' at His table ' was as important as the eating of the loaf.[2] There is no difficulty in interpreting the metaphor drawn from a wide area of Near Eastern life. It is common enough in and out of the references of the Scripture.

The following ' picture ' is not in the same category. What does this metaphor imply ? On what ' action ' is it based ? *πτέρνα* occurs only

[1] Cf. the alternate readings in Ac 1^{4}. Also Ac 10^{41}. See *Apostles of Palestine*, 21. This note was written before attention was directed by the Rev. James Mackintosh, Librarian of Trinity College, Glasgow, to the fact that ' the new Greek text adopts the variant reading ', or that of the A.V.—' eateth bread with me ' (as against R.S.V., etc.).

[2] Lk 22^{30}.

here in the New Testament. This is in quotation from the Psalm, though the Old Testament does provide other instances of *heel* [1] The Arabic word both in Psalm and Gospel means, radically, to 'follow closely', with derivatives that have the significance of 'issue' or 'result'. It is (as it were) the 'last' thing—certainly as a person walks.[2] The root has come into prominence to-day with the Jordanian Port of 'Aqaba. What then does the phrase presuppose? Is the 'lifting up of the heel' a forward movement or 'kick', or one backwards? Does it mean a physically 'brutal' action as apparently interpreted by some commentaries? The Arabic word in Psalm and Gospel is cognate with the Hebrew.[3]

Several years ago in holidays the teaching staff of institutions in Jerusalem were used on other duties. It often fell to me to help the clergy in Galilee for services in the larger villages. One Sunday afternoon, due for a service of Holy Communion in Shef 'Amru, I had agreed with the Lay Reader kindly to conduct Evensong and preach, as it took three or four hours to reach Shef 'Amru from another village. Just before the sermon I slipped in from the vestry in cassock and surplice and sat on a chair in the Sanctuary. I could not help noticing that one old gentleman was very upset (with me). After the service he asked candidly why, since I was a minister, I did not know how to behave in church. Nonplussed I requested to be told what I had done. His reply was that if I had visited in his home, I would never have been so rude as to cross my legs with one knee over the other, so that the sole of my foot pointed in anyone's direction. Here was the height of discourtesy and I had done this in the House of God (even though the cassock covered the offending members). I was behaving badly with my foot almost touching the Holy Table. No one had ever told me of the impoliteness of this attitude. Thereafter I was careful to avoid crossing my knees whether in church or in a private house. A Palestinian friend (now in London) said recently that he remembered very often that when the family went to church and one of the children inadvertently crossed his knees sitting in the pew, his father would lean across and 'uncross' the child's legs. Here seems one reason why the Oriental on the floor sits cross-legged, *so that the sole of the foot is not* pointing in anyone's direction; while in Muslim Prayer the worshipper's heels are tucked away behind him, whether 'Prayer' is in the mosque or in private. But this pointing of the sole of the foot in anyone's direction, made so much more deliberate with the 'lifting up of the heel', is not merely a sign of impoliteness or discourtesy. It goes deeper—a revelation of contempt, treachery, even animosity. However could a 'familiar friend' have been guilty of this? Thayer's derivation that the figure is borrowed 'either from kicking, or from a wrestler tripping up his antagonist' and so 'injure by trickery' scarcely meets the point.[4] The metaphors portraying this 'attitude' are different in the other Gospels. Mark has the bare reference to the 'dipping'.[5] Matthew and Luke each mention the 'hand', the former in respect of the necessity for using it in grasping of the bitter herbs for the dipping;[6] the latter emphasizing that the hand of the 'traitor' was with Him 'at the table'.[7] There does not appear any implication of trickery here except *vis à vis* the other members of the apostolic band. It is difficult not to assume that if they had realised the developing situation, they would not have put a stop to the machinations of Judas Iscariot. The Gospels each and all agree that our Lord felt the attitude (whatever it was) deeply; and was hurt by it. R.S.V. renders the phrase in the Psalm as 'my bosom friend'. It may be worth noting that in Gethsemane the Lord's question to Judas includes the word ἑταῖρος, peculiar to Matthew in the New Testament—'My good friend'.[8] It was someone very close who had acted thus dastardly. The act was surely indicative of something more heinous than trickery; that might have been sudden or impulsive, but here was animosity studied, deliberate, calculating.[9] Was Judas not revealing the fact that in his own

[1] Ps 41^{9} (Gn 3^{15} 49^{17}, Ps 49^{5}—in the last instance the R.S.V. reading 'persecutors' which is supported by the Arabic, from the root of 'heel', *i.e.*, 'those that are after me').

[2] The words in Hebrew and Arabic are cognate.

[3] The Rev. J. S. Trimingham, in a letter, mentions a somewhat similar metaphor in *mudawwir ka'bahu* or 'turning the ankle' with force of bringing bad luck.

[4] Grimm, *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament, ad loc.* This second interpretation is also mentioned by Meyer as 'less appropriate'.

[5] Mk 14^{20}.

[6] Mt 26^{23}. There would hardly be much difference in the Semitic mind between 'dippeth' (A.V.) and 'dipped' (R.S.V. and predecessors). The idea was complete in our Lord's mind at the moment of speaking.

[7] Lk 22^{21}.

[8] Mt 26^{50} (also 11^{19} 20^{13} 22^{12}).

[9] The only commentaries (among thirteen consulted) to mention 'contempt' are the *Expositor's Greek Testament* and the *Moffatt* (Marcus Dods and Macgregor), though Barrett says that 'the last four words of the LXX clumsily render an idiom meaning "to scorn" . . . perhaps . . . "the action of one who shakes off the dust of his feet against another"'. Other commentaries vary between 'trickery' or the

inmost attitudes he really despised his Master? *Hapax legomena* are admittedly not easy of interpretation. In this case have we not to look for something revealing with the dramatic solemnity of the scene—chiefly of the Lord's own feeling towards this strangely mistaken Judean 'apostle' on the night on which He was betrayed?

ERIC F. F. BISHOP

Redhill, Surrey

'That They All May Be One'

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February, 1959 (lxx. 149) Dr. Pollard's exposition of Jn 17^{21} rightly stresses, by a parallelism with the doctrine of the Trinity, that the unity of the disciples of Christ is to be a unity-with-distinctions. But he uses the context only to show the *pattern* or *prototype* of this unity, and almost ignores the twofold *purpose* of the unity. The unity of the disciples is needed so that they may be perfected and so that the world may believe. If the full context is taken, and if the unity is to be, as Dr. Pollard finely says, that of *perichoresis* or mutual interpenetration, it is hard to see how it can be achieved merely by 'inter-communion and mutual recognition and inter-change of ministries' between denominations which continue to go their separate ways and compete with one another in the *same* spheres of operation. Nothing less than a complete organic union can come anywhere near the pattern of that deep union between Father and Son, whose distinction is only in their *separate* spheres of operation and is not through any failure to see eye to eye on the same things!

Though the unions achieved or planned in India and Pakistan fall far short of the ideal, at least it must be said that they are not based only on organization or aim at uniformity. These unions allow for variety of expression within a living together in a unity of spirit in which the competitive temper has been done away. These plans have grown out of the pastoral concern for the edification and holiness of the Church in India, out of the evangelical concern to proclaim effectively the gospel of reconciliation through a reconciled and united Church, and in a theological concern to experience in some measure that *perichoresis* which is seen in its fullness in the unity of the Father and Son, but which is certainly not possible between denominational groups that insist on maintaining their differences as walls between them and allow only a limited interpenetration.

The connexion of Jn 17^{21} with church union schemes may not be obvious at first sight, but its full exegesis will give a profound basis for organic church union.

E. L. WENGER

Serampore College
Serampore, India

Death of the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Kissane, D.D., L.S.S.

THE death took place in Dublin on 21st February, 1959, of the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Kissane, D.D., L.S.S., President of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, sometime Professor of Sacred Scripture and Oriental Languages in that College and sometime Professor of Biblical Theology in University College, Dublin. Wherever the Old Testament is studied in Hebrew, his large-scale commentaries on Job, Isaiah (2 vols.) and Psalms (2 vols.) are known and valued.

Professor James Muilenburg of New York in *The Interpreter's Bible Commentary* on Is 42^{19}, 'who is blind as he that is at peace with me?', discussing the many different ways in which the word 'meshullam' (מְשֻׁלָּם) is translated, says, 'Perhaps the best solution is that proposed by Kissane, "the covenanted one", derived from the verb meaning "to be in covenant of peace"'.

On Dr. Kissane's comment on Is 43^{19}, 'I will even make a way in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert', he writes: 'Way . . . paths. Instead of "paths" the Hebrew has "rivers"; but this anticipates 20c-d, and the parallelism suggests that "rivers" (nāhārōth), (נְהָרוֹת) is a mistake for "paths" (nĕthîbōth), (נְתִיבוֹת)'. So he translates: 'Paths in the barren desert'.

That emendation was suggested by Dr. Kissane in 1943, four years before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah. When that manuscript was published by Dr. Millar Burrows in 1950, it confirmed Dr. Kissane's brilliant conjecture. It read 'n th i bh i m' נתיבים, 'paths', which is the masculine plural form. Dr. Kissane had suggested the feminine plural which is the form used in other parts of the Old Testament.

Scholars of all Christian Churches and of the Jewish Community mourn the passing of Dr. Edward J. Kissane, a great Old Testament scholar and a modest friendly man.

ROBERT J. WILSON

The Presbyterian College,
Belfast

'kicking of a horse'. Neither wrestling nor kicking seems to provide a Semitic picture. But the Hebrew meaning of the verb as originally 'making big' or 'magnifying' does not differ overmuch from the Arabic and Greek. Some commentaries suggest 'brutal' without saying whether the adjective is literal or metaphorical. [For much of the foregoing I am indebted to the Rev. James Mackintosh.]

Literature

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

Dr. F. W. Beare, Professor of New Testament Studies at Trinity College, Toronto, has written *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (A. and C. Black; 16s. net) in the series 'Black's New Testament Commentaries', edited by Professor Henry Chadwick, Regius Professor of Divinity, Oxford. The commentary is justly advertised as 'a scholarly study, suitable for the Greekless student and the serious general reader, of St. Paul's most moving Epistle as a prime source at once of devotional and doctrinal inspiration'. Dr. Beare is well known on this side of the Atlantic as the gifted author of 'The First Epistle of Peter' which has recently been issued in a second edition, revised and enlarged, but the new commentary, while equally scholarly, has a glow of religious conviction and a depth of insight which are distinctive of it. 'No one', writes Dr. Beare, 'can make a sustained effort to understand this epistle without a constant deepening of his conviction of the truth and reality of the Christian faith; or without a growing sense of his own deficiencies and halfheartedness as a follower of Christ Jesus the Lord.' 'The glowing intensity of the Apostle's devotion', he continues, 'makes our own seem flickering and fitful, and altogether unworthy of the joy that is set before us, the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.'

A useful and valuable Introduction, consisting of forty-six pages, discusses the questions of authenticity, integrity, and destination of the Epistle, the time and place of writing, its character, theology, and what Dr. Beare calls its 'spirituality'. An excellent Bibliography follows, together with four Special Studies, and full Indexes are supplied. The conclusions reached are those which are usually accepted. On the vexed question of the destination of the Epistle the author gives his verdict in favour of Rome rather than Cæsarea or Ephesus. He thinks that the Epistle as we now have it is a compilation of three separate letters of Paul, the earliest being the interpolated fragment 3^{2}-4^{1}, the letter of thanks to the Philippians in $4^{10\text{-}20}$, and the framework of the whole, 1^{1}-3^{1} $4^{2\text{-}9.21\text{-}23}$, written towards the end of the Apostle's life.

The Commentary itself, consisting of a hundred and eleven pages, is competent, judicious, and moving in its intensity. Especially interesting are the numerous cases in which Dr. Beare discusses the meaning of the Greek words and constructions, and he does this in such a way that it is possible that 'Greekless students' and even 'the serious general reader' will find it worthwhile to acquire a knowledge of the original. Even more interesting and important is the discussion of $2^{5\text{-}11}$, which Dr. Beare treats twice, in the Introduction and the Commentary, and supplements by an Appended Note by his colleague, Professor E. R. Fairweather on 'The "Kenotic" Christology'. As appears to be increasingly common, Ernst Lohmeyer's hypothesis of a pre-Pauline Hymn is accepted in its main outlines, although Dr. Beare prefers to think that the Apostle is using a hymn first composed by a gifted writer of his own circle. One could wish that Dr. Beare had himself treated the kenotic implications of the hymn instead of allocating this task to a colleague, for Professor Fairweather's Note dismisses somewhat too easily the idea of a kenotic Christology as inconsistent with the Divine immutability and as implying a real ontological change in the doctrine of God.

From the foregoing I hope it is clear that Professor Beare's Commentary is one to possess, since it is sure to enhance our appreciation of St. Paul's profound and personal letter.

Vincent Taylor

ON BEING A CHRISTIAN

Since Bertrand Russell has allowed some of his American admirers to reprint his tract, 'Why I am Not a Christian', and use it as the title of a collection of some other of his more militant rationalist essays, it is worth while to examine it afresh, and Dr. C. H. Douglas Clark has picked out Russell's main assertions and exposed the rashness of many of his generalizations and the irresponsibility of many of his judgments—*Christianity and Bertrand Russell* (Lutterworth Press; 5s. net). Perhaps Dr. Clark takes this entertaining rationalist *jeu d'esprit* too seriously. But he is no doubt right in thinking that it prejudices some youthful minds against Christianity and weakens the appeal to men of the goodwill of Russell's present valuable contributions to the cause of peace. Anyway Russell's reasons for not being a Christian are handled in this little book respectfully and thoughtfully, with Christian conviction and philosophic common sense.

Deeper issues are raised and judiciously handled in Miss Margaret B. Hobling's Swarthmore Lecture, *The Concrete and the Universal* (Allen and Unwin; cloth, 6s. net, paper, 4s. 6d. net). 'How very hard it is to be a Christian', wrote Browning, and perhaps it is particularly hard to be a well-balanced truly Catholic Christian. One-sided Christians

abound, because we seek to avoid tension by denying or ignoring one or other of truths which appear contradictory and are really complementary. So F. D. Maurice was led to denounce all ' isms ' which build up one truth to the neglect of others. In like manner Miss Hobling would have us ' be prepared to accept, even to welcome, tension into our lives ', to recognize that we cannot oppose the concrete to the universal, nor yet divorce them. In various ways, in interpreting the Christian faith, this tension is apparent. We see it in the discussion of the relation of general revelation to special revelation, of natural religion to revealed religion, of the truth of natural science to the truth of history, and of the Christ of faith to the historical Jesus. Miss Hobling is concerned with the familiar ' scandal of particularity ' which causes so many to reject or misinterpret the Christian faith. We cannot, she argues, affirm the centrality and supremacy of the Incarnate Word in such a narrow and inclusive sense as to prevent us being open and receptive to revelations of God in other faiths, and yet we may not affirm these other revelations or images of God in such a way as to obscure the indispensable uniqueness of the revelation or image of God in Christ. Writing as a Friend, Miss Hobling concludes : ' I hope I have shown that this is a tension that arises within the Christian faith, with which our fellow-Christians in other churches are wrestling. I hope I have also shown that the seventeenth-century Friends . . . faced and accepted the same tension.' The theme is developed with illuminating quotations, and Miss Hobling's lecture will appeal to many outside the Society of Friends, to whom it was first addressed.

HERBERT G. WOOD

THE OLD TESTAMENT

A Journey through the Old Testament, by Professor M. A. Beek, translated by Arnold J. Pomerans, with a Foreword by Dr. H. H. Rowley (Hodder and Stoughton ; 21s. net), is a completely fascinating book. In his Introduction the author says : ' It is my firm personal conviction that there is no other book in the whole world as exciting as the Bible. We can devote a life-time to its study, and yet not tire for a single moment.' In this book Professor Beek succeeds outstandingly in communicating his own interest and thrill to others.

There are two ways of writing history. There is the way of the annalist, who follows events from week to week, and day to day, and, if possible, hour to hour. And there is the way of opening windows at significant moments, so that a series of dramatic glimpses of great moments are given. The second method is the method of Professor Beek. With vivid strokes he paints pen-pictures of great Biblical moments and conceptions and ideas. The book is in sections—The Dawn, The Forefathers, The Exodus from Egypt, In the Time of the Judges, The Kings, the Age of the Prophets, Exile and Return, Wisdom, The Songs of Israel, The Wording of Holy Writ.

Professor Beek has a gift for the vivid presentation of facts. When he is thinking of the age of the world, as scientists see it, he quotes Dr. A. Kuenen : ' If we condense the age of the earth into one year, the Palaeozoic Age with the first fossilized fauna began in the middle of September, coal was laid down at the beginning of November, the dinosaurs were abroad about St. Nicholas's Day (December 6th) and Christmas. Neanderthal man went hunting for mammoth and cave bears on the evening of December 31st. Julius Cæsar invaded England at 11.24 p.m., and you yourself were born on the last stroke of midnight.' When he is talking about numbers, he says that if the Biblical numbers of the exodus from Egypt were correct, and if we assume that they marched in columns of four, with one yard between each column, the front line of the army would have reached Damascus by the time the rear was still crossing the Egyptian border !

There are some curious emphases in this book. Professor Beek, for instance, takes time to say that Moses is rather more a legendary than an historical figure, and yet he relates other incidents, such as the incident of Elijah and the prophets of Baal at Carmel, without any suggestion that they are other than literal fact.

This is the most interesting book about the Old Testament that we have seen for many a long day. We can hardly imagine a better book to put into any one's hands to convince him of the interest of the Bible, and of the supreme importance of the message of the Bible.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

THE CHRISTIAN GOSPEL

The Wonder of the Christian Gospel, by Dr. J. M. Shaw, Professor Emeritus of Systematic Theology at Kingston, Ontario, is a popularized abbreviation of his larger book entitled ' Christian Doctrine ' (Lutterworth Press ; 12s. 6d. net). The earlier book was written for students, this one for the general reader, perhaps also for the preacher, because this is a book of theology made preachable. Dr. Shaw believes that ' one of the great needs of the present time is a statement of the substance of the Christian faith ', which will be ' readily understood by ordinary members of the Church '. In this book he offers such a statement. It does not claim to be a comprehensive

study of theology. We do not find in it, for instance, chapters on the Doctrine of God or on the Trinity. These omissions may be due not only to the writer's desire to be understood by the general reader, but his determination that what he writes shall be ' of vital relevance to our everyday life and thought '.

The note of wonder is to be found not only in the title, but throughout the book. The articles of the faith are not so much argued as shown to be well-based in Scripture, and then expounded so as to show what privileged people we are if we can accept the Christian faith as true.

The first thing to wonder at is the assurance we find in Jesus Christ that ' God the great creator and sustainer of all ', is interested in each single one of His children. Then in succeeding chapters we read of the wonder of the Incarnation, of Gethsemane (which is likened to Christ's ' finest hour '), the Cross, Resurrection and Ascension, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the fellowship of the Church, the means of grace, full salvation and the final consummation.

The writer has a gift of illustration and of apt quotation, and this helps to make this heart-warming little book a very pleasant and persuasive presentation of the main essentials in the gospel, which enables the reader to grasp afresh what a wonderful privilege it is to be a believing Christian.

C. L. Mitton

CONFESSION

Confession, by Pastor Max Thurian, is the eighth volume in the S.C.M. series ' Studies in Ministry and Worship ' (10s. 6d. net). Max Thurian, a member of the Taizé Community, certainly reminds us of the great pastoral responsibility of bringing privately to burdened consciences the assurance of the forgiveness of sins, and here one thankfully acknowledges his profound concern. But the author says much more than this, as illustrated by the form of Absolution (p. 139) which he suggests for use in the practice of private Confession.

> Almighty God have mercy upon thee, and having forgiven thee thy sins bring thee to everlasting life. Amen.
>
> (The confessor rises and stands in front of the penitent.)
>
> The Lord breathed on His disciples and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.
>
> (The confessor may lay his hands on the penitent.)
>
> May our Lord Jesus Christ absolve thee; and I by His authority do absolve thee from every bond of sin.
>
> Thus do I grant thee absolution from thy sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

John 20^{23}, Mt 16^{19} and 18^{18}—these passages are interpreted as the authority for Absolution being regarded as a *Sacrament* in addition to Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In my judgment, Thurian deviates at this point from the principles of the Protestant Reformation, and I do not think that the sacerdotalism which could follow from this idea of Absolution is the teaching of the New Testament.

A. Allan McArthur

YET AGAIN THE SCROLLS

This time, *A Guide to the Scrolls*! Even to discover a fresh title for a Scrolls book nowadays requires ingenuity. The present book, by members of the Extra-Mural Department of Nottingham University, J. Posen, R. P. C. Hanson and A. R. C. Leaney (editor)—*A Guide to the Scrolls: Nottingham Studies on the Qumran Discoveries* (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net), is what might be expected from such a source—informative, reasonably safe and interesting. Various theories are very briefly outlined, followed by a description of the discovery and of the sect. Questions of identity with the Essenes and the Church are discussed, and parallels with the New Testament elaborated. There are some highly original suggestions, but some of them are unlikely to carry weight. For instance, the idea that the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll ' could have been one of the versions on which the later (Massoretic) text was based ' patently lacks balance. It may be disconcerting, too, that in a book of this nature Dr. Hanson develops a lengthy and complicated argument to reject the identity of the sect of the Damascus Document with the Essenes whilst allowing it in the other Scrolls, on the grounds that the Damascus Document refers to an earlier period and an earlier community than does, for example, the Manual of Discipline. Again, by vigorously attacking Oscar Cullmann's thesis of affinity between the Manual and the Clementine Homilies, Dr. Hanson seems to be at cross purposes with his own editor as well as to enter on very controversial issues. But it is unfair to disqualify a useful book because of a few indiscretions which, at their worst, only show that the authors are anxious to create a coherent story out of a welter of contradictory verdicts by specialists.

B. J. Roberts

CALVIN

Dr. Ronald S. Wallace, who a few years ago gave us a study of 'Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacraments', has put us further in his debt by his latest volume, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Oliver and Boyd; 27s. 6d. net).

The footnotes to almost every page reveal the author's very extensive reading in Calvin's works, not the Institutes only but also his Sermons and Commentaries. Dr. Wallace finds that the priesthood of all believers with Calvin is not a doctrine which exalts the individual in his liberty apart from the Church and that Calvin lays great stress on order and moderation in all Christian behaviour. What is more notable and to many readers may be news is that Dr. Wallace can say that 'in the course of study it was found that all Calvin's decisions on widely differing aspects of the Christian life can be understood and seen in their unity as they are seen to arise from his doctrine of the person and work of Christ as involving once-for-all the sanctification and destiny of His Church'. While Calvin is well aware of the conflict and suffering which the Christian life involves, he teaches that that life is predominantly one of happiness, assurance and achievement.

This is a valuable study where reference to detailed points is made relatively easy by the index and an extended table of contents. We note a misprint on p. xvi.

STEWART MECHIE

AN ESSAY IN CHRISTIAN RE-INTERPRETATION

On the face of it, it is somewhat startling to read, at Whitsuntide 1959, an account of Pentecost in terms of the 'release of libidinal energy', and that the achievement of Jesus was to have proclaimed and lived out an 'archetypal synthesis' capable of bringing this about. Those familiar with this kind of language will realize that Dr. W. Montgomery Watt in *The Cure for Human Troubles* (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net) is seeking to interpret the gospel in modern psychological, especially Jungian, terms. Once adjusted to this, the reader will find solid justification for the author's claim (endorsed in a Foreword by the Bishop of Edinburgh) that his book is in intention completely orthodox. It is through the vocabulary but not the mentality of the psychologist that Dr. Watt would express the Biblical revelation.

The opening diagnosis traces the source of our troubles to the appearance of self-consciousness in man and is, in effect, in line with the traditional Christian doctrine of original sin. But, as Maltby used to stress, no diagnosis without a cure. The essential cure lies in what has been achieved by Jesus. Dr. Watt argues that the New Testament categories of the work of Christ are all capable of expression in terms of Jesus' synthesis of Old Testament archetypes. The fruit of Jesus' achievement is available to all who will apply it. It is the weakness of much Christian writing to plead the finished work of Christ in the first century but not to make contemporary application. This charge cannot be levelled against Dr. Watt who in the important third section of the book develops the conception of archetypes and makes manifold application of its Christian use to social and individual concerns.

The argument is brilliantly presented in clear and forceful prose and touches, in one way or another, on most of our current concerns. It may well be that this book proves to be an important event not only in itself but in that to which it may lead. We have too little of this kind of apologetic. A brief closing chapter of 'Philosophic Reflections' underlines this, for Dr. Watt writes in the hope of convincing the open-minded that the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity are not obscurantist, but successful attempts 'to give a reasoned and systematic account of what is implied in the achievement of Jesus'.

We welcome and commend a remarkable work of theological translation.

MARCUS WARD

LITURGY

The series 'Studies in Eucharistic Faith and Practice' (Mowbray), which is connected with the Alcuin Club, contains some books on traditional liturgies which may serve as useful introductions. *The Gallican Rite* (6s. net), by the late Rev. W. S. Porter, was designed as part of a larger work. A useful bibliography has been added by someone else, possibly Dr. F. L. Cross, who wrote the Prefatory Note. In places the work has the air of being a very elementary introduction, as when the *Missa fidelium* is likened to the chancel and the *Missa catechumenorum* to the nave of a Church, but the author presupposes a by no means elementary knowledge of Church History. The question of the provenance of this rite is complicated, and is here carefully handled. Then follows an account of the various parts of the rite, a description of its chief characteristics, and the story of its disappearance. It is often said that there are many Gallican elements in the Roman missal, but they are in fact to be found in the Pontifical and Ritual rather than the missal. The Gallican rites despite their tendency to irrelevant and didactic prolixity are of importance

because they set great store by 'heortological' variation, that is, the provision of a large number of parts of the service which vary according to the season of the Christian year. Those who have inherited the 'free' tradition of worship are accustomed to a large element of variation and need the discipline of the Christian year to give order to this variety.

The Orthodox Liturgy (4s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Austin Oakley, treats similarly a liturgy, or rather a small group of closely related liturgies, which are, of course, still in widespread regular use. In these liturgies the amount of seasonal variation is very small, for each celebration sets out at considerable length the whole drama of redemption. One wonders what revision the future may bring even to these venerable structures. We cannot but deplore, as also in the Gallican rite, the virtual neglect of the Sermon, which ought to be regarded as a major variable element. The difficulty of the Orthodox churches must be to convey to the lay worshippers an adequate appreciation of the rich treasures which the rite contains. To catch its spirit, it is better to attend it, as many people do on ecumenical occasions, and this book would be a helpful preparation. It has, however, some curious turns of phrase, such as 'not unrarely', and some mistakes in the Greek breathings and accents; and at page 30, note 1, 'baptized' should be 'unbaptized'.

A. Raymond George

The New Testament Text of St. Ambrose, by Mr. R. W. Muncey (Cambridge University Press; 32s. 6d. net), is a volume in the second series of 'Texts and Studies', which is under the general editorship of Dr. C. H. Dodd. This is a book of the highest scholarship, the most meticulous accuracy, and the greatest importance.

Its aim is 'to reconstruct the New Testament text as quoted by St. Ambrose; to compare his text with the Old Latin texts and Vulgate texts, and to examine the text with reference to the underlying Greek'.

In the Gospels Mr. Muncey compares the text of the quotations of Ambrose with the text of ff2, Codex Corbeiensis, which may date as early as A.D. 375–425, at the same time taking into account the readings of a, b and f, Codex Vercellensis, Codex Veronensis, and Codex Brixianus. In the Acts he compares the text of Ambrose with Codex Bezae (D), Codex Laudianus (e) and Codex Gigas (gig). In the Pauline Epistles he uses Codex Claromontanus, Sangermanensis, Augiensis and Boernerianus for comparison. In the Catholic Epistles he uses the Fragmenta Frisingensia (r); and in the Apocalypse he uses Codex Gigas.

He finds that Ambrose is on the whole an accurate quoter. He finds that the underlying text of Ambrose often agrees with the Textus Receptus, but sometimes departs from that text to agree with Codex B (Vaticanus) and its allies; and he examines the relationship of Ambrose to the 'Western' interpolations in the Gospels.

Mr. Muncey has a section of Syntax and Vocabulary, and valuable sections on 'Europeanisms' and Græcisms in the text of Ambrose. He then sets out in full Ambrose's text of the New Testament.

The devoted labour which has gone to the making of this book is more than worthwhile, for this is a book of the first importance for the study of the text of the New Testament.

Messrs. Collins have added to their list of 'Fontana Books' *The Need to Believe*, by the Rev. Murdo Ewen Macdonald, Minister of St. George's West Church, Edinburgh. Here is a book to put into the hands of any educated and earnest seeker, whether believer or unbeliever. Mr. Macdonald knows the difficulties of faith to-day, and in these sixteen short chapters he faces them with patience, charity and sincerity and ends by demanding a verdict. We trust that the 2s. 6d. price and attractive format will win for this book the many readers to whom it could be a real help.

Dr. Maldwyn Edwards has good success in his attempt to appraise John Wesley as he appeared to his family, friends and critics. *The Astonishing Youth* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net) is a misleading title for the book covers the whole life and not merely its less significant beginning. Dr. Edwards uses facts, all drawn from original sources, to set Wesley, if not in a greater, certainly in a more attractive light, than in the larger historical and theological studies.

One of the treasures brought into Methodism by Wesley from the Mother Church was the Order of Service for Holy Communion which, with some slight but significant modifications, has been used by Methodists since 1784. That the Methodists of to-day may enter more fully into their heritage, Dr. F. B. Westbrook has written *The Holy Communion Service: Explanatory Notes* (Epworth Press; 5s. net) dealing simply and fully with rubrics and text, and adding a selection of the Wesleys' hymns on the Lord's Supper. The whole provides an excellent, and much needed, aid to devotion and understanding and offers a significant footnote to Methodist doctrine and piety.

'I am an agnostic, not because I want to be but because I simply cannot make Christianity

work.' For readers, like the writer of these words, who are perplexed by the seeming unreality of Christian belief and Christian living, the Rev. Keith de Berry, M.A., Rector of St. Aldate's, Oxford, has written a little book, *The Making of a Christian* (Hodder and Stoughton ; 3s. 6d. net). We heartily commend it, for it is clear and practical and firmly based on both Scripture and experience, and we wish it a wide circulation both within and without the membership of the churches.

The Independent Press has reprinted a small book by Bernard Lord Manning, *Why Not Abandon the Church ?* which was first published in 1939. Much of the vigour and freshness of the spoken word is retained in these four talks, and the lapse of twenty years has made no difference to their relevance. Intended as a defence of Congregationalism, they have much to say to all young people who want to know what Christianity is and what it requires of them. We commend this book, published at 6s. 6d. net, our only complaint being that the title is too negative and limited to do justice to the interest and scope of the contents.

The Inter-Varsity Fellowship has published at 4s. net a useful book—*God's Church*, by the Rev. Alan M. Stibbs, M.A., Vice-Principal of Oak Hill College, London. It is a careful and clearly written study in the Biblical doctrine of the People of God. Some may question the author's interpretation of a few Scripture passages ; but no Christian reader will be able to work through this book with his Bible open before him without finding numerous important insights relevant to the issues of church life to-day.

Mrs. Anna Lætitia Barbauld was a minor eighteenth century authoress whose fame as a writer of children's books outlasted the honour which contemporaries ascribed to her for her more substantial works. Sir Walter Scott used to say that it was thanks to her that he became a poet. Her maiden name was Aikin and she was a granddaughter of John Aikin, a young Scot who left his native Kirkcudbright for London soon after the Great Fire. Her great-grandfather on her mother's side, John Jennings, was one of the clergy ejected in 1662 for refusing to accept the Act of Uniformity. Mrs. Betsy Rodgers, herself a descendant of John Aikin, has drawn upon family papers and letters to give us in *Georgian Chronicle : Mrs. Barbauld and her Family*, a delightful account of a succession of distinguished people who had links with many persons of literary and scientific eminence. The chief interest for readers of this journal may be the vivid presentation of eighteenth century English Dissent.

The last section of the book, which is published by Messrs. Methuen and Co. at 21s. net, consists of hitherto unpublished letters.

Logical Positivism, Existentialism, Historicism, Thomism, Mysticism—these are the *Five 'Isms of Today* dealt with by Canon Greville Norburn in a little book published at 2s. 6d. by the Modern Churchmen's Union. They are terms that constantly recur in serious contemporary discussion, but it may be surmised that understanding of them is often vague. What do they mean and what is their bearing on religious belief and on theology ? Canon Norburn has a gift for mediating the thought of the philosophers to ordinary readers ; and we are sure many will be grateful to him for this useful piece of popular interpretation.

An important book by Professor Hermann Diem of Tubingen is now available in a translation by Harold Knight—*Dogmatics* (Oliver and Boyd ; 30s. net). In Diem's view the contemporary theological situation shows a gulf between the work of the historian and the theologian, between dogmatics and exegesis—and this gulf means fundamentally that the question of the significance of the historical Jesus for the faith and doctrine of the Church requires to be probed into afresh. For it is certain that in the New Testament ' Kerugma ', fact and meaning, event and response are combined. To bring this situation into light Diem presents at length and with abundant material the contrasted types of thought represented by Bultmann and by Barth. The existentialist strain in the Bultmann approach seems to make insignificant any inquiry about the event-content of the life of Jesus. On the other hand, while Barth emphasizes revelation and the Word of God in the witness of Scripture he has not clarified for New Testament scholarship the criterion by which the critical exegete is to handle the unity of Scripture. His contention that the Canon has dogmatic unity and clarity is questionable. In his exposition of this situation, and in his attempt to close the unfortunate gap Professor Diem is led to consider many issues in the theological field—Jesus self-attested in His work, His relation to the Old Testament, the apostolic tradition, the Canon, the nature of dogma, the authority in faith and exegesis. So that, all in all, this book is full and rich. It makes arduous reading. Its fullness at times obscures the track intended. But every serious student of theology will find reward in listening in to Diem's argument.

Apostolic Succession[1]

By the Very Reverend W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.Lit., Dean of St. Paul's

'They were astonished at his teachings: for he taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes'.—Mk 1^{22} (R.V.).

The authority with which Jesus is said to have taught is not the authority which we attribute to an expert in a subject who has gained his right to be heard by years of study. Mark wants to say that Jesus was precisely not like that. The scribes were learned men, experts. Their authority lay in their supposed expertness in the interpretation of sacred texts. They were full of quotations, references and interpretations. Nor was the authority that of recognised office. The people did not hear Jesus with attention and respect because they believed Him to be the Messiah. Mark makes it quite clear that Jesus took care that they should not know that He made any claim to that office. 'He would not suffer the demons to speak because they knew Him.' The authority of which the Evangelist speaks resembles that of the old prophets who spoke out of their personal experience of God and proclaimed the Word of God as they received it in their minds and hearts. Jesus uttered searching words which came, as it were, from One who had been with God and knew His will and these words found a response in the minds of His hearers, leaving them troubled if not convinced. The authority with which Jesus spoke was the power of the Spirit.

The Church of Christ, so the New Testament teaches us, is the body of Christ and is to have the mind of Christ. It, too, is to be prophetic, to live by the Spirit and to speak with the authority of the Spirit. New Testament teaching about the Church makes no sense unless we keep firm hold of this. Christ's legacy to the Church is the Spirit, not an infallible authority vested in a man; not an infallible book, but the Spirit. The Church was certainly not intended to be a collection of scribes with a new sacred text to expound, but a fellowship under the guidance of the Spirit. And surely the mode of that guidance is indicated. Jesus expects those who follow Him to 'discern the signs of the times', which include the needs of the day in which they live. And not only to discern these needs, but to face them and grapple with them in the Spirit of Christ, believing that the Word of God, and the deed for God which is required will be revealed.

[1] This is the sermon (in shorter form) which Dr. Matthews preached in St. Paul's on May 31st, 1959, when he referred to the problem of the relations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland.—Editor.

I wonder whether the Church is quite like that in fact. I wonder sometimes whether the scribes have after all taken the lead and enticed us to think too much of what was done in the past and not realistically enough about what needs to be done now. This reflection has been reinforced by the recent proceedings in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and what appears to be a set-back in progress towards the restoration of full fellowship between the two ancient churches. I may be going to say things with which some whom I deeply respect will disagree. If that is the case, I am sorry, but I feel it is laid upon me to speak my mind on this subject for what it may be worth.

Christian unity is the need of the times, and episcopacy is the problem. It seems to me that there are two logical points of view:

1. We may hold that episcopacy, as we have it in the Anglican Church, is of the essence of the Church, and it would follow from that that where there is no bishop there is no Church. From that again it would follow that Presbyterians are not really part of the universal Church of Christ and their ministry is not a ministry of the Catholic Church nor are their sacraments truly sacraments of the Church. If that is the view that we take, then I ask, *What are we talking about?* The only consistent policy could be to try to convert Presbyterians to our way of thinking.

2. A great many of us, I am sure, do not feel able to accept this rigid view of the nature of the Church. When we are confronted by what appear to be the manifest gifts of the Spirit of the Church of Scotland we feel it is impossible to deny that it is a part of the Catholic Church, and we feel compelled to agree that its sacraments are real sacraments and its Holy Communion is really a communion of the body and blood of Christ, its ministry a real ministry of Christ. This is again a logical and comprehensible view. If it is our view, then I ask, *What are we waiting for?* Why cannot we have inter-communion now and express in action our real fellowship with one another by meeting at the Table of the Lord?

In short, what I would like to know is, Why cannot we do the religious thing first and think of the theological justification afterwards? Why not begin with the act that faith and love would inspire? The problems of order, including that of episcopacy, might well appear to us in a new light when they were considered with the background of realized unity in worship.

Sacrifice and Morality: A Rejoinder

By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., B.Litt., F.B.A., The University of Manchester

I am flattered that Professor Dobbie has devoted an article to the refutation of my views (The Expository Times, lxx. [1958–59], 297-300), though I should have been more flattered if he had taken the trouble to understand more fully what I had written, when he would have seen that many of his arrows fall wide of the mark.

(1) Professor Dobbie charges me with formulating 'the concept of a sinner incapable of repentance', and says it is doubtful whether the prophets would have formulated such a conception, since their proclamation of moral imperatives would lack validity if response to them was impossible. In fact, I no more formulate such a concept than did the prophets. To justify his charge, Professor Dobbie takes out of their context some words of mine, and then misunderstands them. He cites my words: 'Such a sinner could not sincerely repent, and for him no sacrifice was valid', and then converts this into the concept of a sinner incapable of repentance. What I said was that sinning with a high hand probably 'meant deliberately sinning, sinning as the expression of the settled purpose of his heart, as distinct from lapsing into sin. Such a sinner could not sincerely repent, and for him no sacrifice was valid. It was the sacrifices of such persons that the prophets declared useless, and in this they were at one with the Law.'[1] It should be clear that what I mean is that the sacrifices of such persons were meaningless, not because they were incapable of repenting in the future, but because they could not be truly penitent while they were in such a state. This is made clear from a passage in another of my works, with which Professor Dobbie is familiar, since he brings it under examination in his article. There I say: 'No plea for forgiveness could be sincere, if there was no renunciation of the sin in the heart; no cry for cleansing could have any meaning, if there was still the purpose to renew the act that brought the stain; no prayer for communion could be genuinely expressed by a sacrifice, if there was no desire to walk in harmony with God's will'.[2]

(2) Professor Dobbie next takes me to task for supposing that the sincerity of the worshipper could validate his sacrifice in the eyes of Yahweh. I cite Lv $5^{5f.}$: 'And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that wherein he hath sinned; and he shall bring his forfeit unto the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned . . . and the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin'. Here it is made clear that confession is essential to effective sacrifice, and confession that is insincere is not real confession. Professor Dobbie says the prophets would have demanded repentance and conversion, whereas this passage demands merely legal compensation and appeasement. It seems to me that he once more misunderstands this passage. True confession involves repentance and conversion, and this is precisely what is here demanded. That Judaism understood the meaning of the Law as I do is clear from Tosephta 5^{9}, which I quote and which Professor Dobbie also quotes: 'Sin offering and guilt offering and death and the Day of Atonement all put together do not effect atonement without repentance'. It is certain that the writer of this passage in Tosephta did not reject the validity of all sacrifice, but that he did reject the validity of sacrifice that was without repentance. Manifestly, therefore, he regarded the spirit of the offerer as integral to effective sacrifice.

(3) When Professor Dobbie next argues that 'the theology of the Temple structure excludes the gospel of a communicable Presence', and that the God of the Temple is not available to men in personal communion, he seems to me again to misunderstand much in the Old Testament. That the High Priest only could enter the Holy of Holies in no sense involves the conclusion that communion with God was available to no one else. When Hannah came to the temple at Shiloh and poured out her soul before the Lord, she clearly did not suppose that she was excluded from the presence of God. Of the Jerusalem Temple the Psalmist cries: 'One thing have I asked of the Lord, that will I seek after; That I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, To behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple. . . . When thou saidst, Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, Lord, will I seek. Hide not thy face from me.'[3] It is hard to suppose that he cherished a theology of exclusion.

(4) Professor Dobbie further charges me with defending Rabbi Judah the Prince's elevation of

[1] *The Unity of the Bible*, 45.

[2] 'The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament', in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxxiii. [1950–51] 91.

[3] Ps $27^{4.\ 8f.}$

the trivial to the level of the important. But I seek to understand Rabbi Judah, not to defend him. Indeed I go on immediately to speak of the dangers of this attitude, and say with manifest approval that it is condemned in the New Testament.[1]

(5) Professor Dobbie supposes that the pre-exilic prophets denounced sacrifices in principle, because their theological presuppositions violated those of their own faith. If Isaiah's denunciation of sacrifice in ch. 1 is absolute, then his denunciation of prayer is equally absolute, since it is included in the same condemnation. If the fact that men's hands were full of blood was immaterial to his denunciation, which would have been equally firm if they were not, it was singularly inept of him to mention the irrelevant fact.

It is unnecessary for me to traverse Professor Dobbie's strictures further. If they lead any reader to turn to what I have written in the works he quotes, he will earn my gratitude. He will earn it still more if he leads them to read the Old Testament. I am persuaded that the penetrating study of the Bible will discover in it, not the congeries of irreconcilable ideas set out in Professor Dobbie's article, but the presentation of a single faith—in varying facets, indeed, and with varying emphasis, just as the Christian faith is diversely presented by Augustine and Luther and Calvin and Wesley, without ceasing to be fundamentally one faith.

[1] *The Unity of the Bible*, 47.

Who Were the Liberals?

By the Reverend T. Francis Glasson, M.A., D.D., London

The word 'liberal' is used in a variety of senses. (1) Politically it refers to the Liberal Party with its emphasis upon freedom. (2) Theologically it has been used for a century or more. J. H. Newman when describing his spiritual pilgrimage spoke of the Liberalism of the early part of the nineteenth century and gave a careful definition of the word in the sense in which he employed it. It represents, he says, the Anti-dogmatic Principle and the rejection of authority; and it is a meritorious feature that in an appendix to his *Apologia* he presents a detailed account of what he means by Liberalism and a summary with eighteen sections. It evidently covered both religious and political matters. We know clearly what Newman meant by the term.

It is obviously being used with a different connotation to-day. (3) Fundamentalists describe as liberals all who do not adhere to the inerrancy of the Bible. On this definition Dean Alford was a liberal and so were Luther, Calvin, Chrysostom . . . the company is a large one. (4) F. Loofs in his book *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* [1913] discusses 'the liberal Jesus-picture' at some length, and by it he means the attempt to write the life of Jesus in purely human terms. His liberals are men like O. Holtzmann, Keim, Weinel and Jülicher. Presumably Harnack would also be included in this definition as his general standpoint was the same.

It is clear that a word which has such a variety of meanings is worse than useless unless a careful definition is given of the way in which it is to be understood. The general tendency of its implication may perhaps be gathered from its opposite—'conservative'. The latter holds fast to tradition while the liberal advocates new advances and radical changes. But unless we specify the exact matters in question the words are nebulous and misleading. Luther was a liberal in his attitude to the Schoolmen. Paul was a liberal in his views on Judaism. On the other hand, the German theologians who went back to the Jesus of history could claim that they were the most conservative of all in their attachment to the original and the primitive. An undefined word is as worthless as an unexamined life, and Socrates quite rightly would have nothing to do with either.

A. G. Hebert in his *Fundamentalism and the Church of God* summarizes Liberalism under eight heads (pp. 20–21). Some of these are doctrinally innocuous; for example, source analysis of the Pentateuch, which the writer himself no doubt accepts in some form or other. But others are indicative of theological heresy, and repeatedly in the book liberals are referred to as heretics (pp. 78, 95). According to Hebert the liberals were defective in their Christology, disbelieved in miracles and had no real belief in revelation. In his praiseworthy desire to be fair to the Fundamentalists of fifty years ago, he implies that they had grounds for rejecting the new developments of Biblical scholarship because these were tied up with heretical theology. But since about 1931 (the year of Hoskyns and Davey's *Riddle of the New Testament*) the position has been completely altered, and

we now find the extremest critical views combined with theological orthodoxy (p. 22).

Many other writers speak in the same strain and the word ' liberal ' has become a term of reproach. There is said to have been a liberal period when the views outlined above were dominant.

Now it is important to make clear which country is being referred to. In Germany anti-supernatural and Unitarian views were indeed dominant around the turn of the century, if one is to judge by the best-known writers. The rise of Karl Barth introduced a new period and a return to more orthodox beliefs in the circles of Continental scholarship. But to apply the shape of this development to the situation in Britain is surely mistaken.

A contributor to THE EXPOSITORY TIMES referring to the theological scene in Britain in the period 1897–1917 wrote in June 1949 : ' Liberalism held the field ; the Gospel according to Harnack was being . . . preached from our pulpits '. I must confess that such statements fill me with amazement when I recall the outstanding names of this period, A. B. Davidson, Marcus Dods, S. R. Driver, C. Gore, George Adam Smith, and many others. Undoubtedly there were individual cases of heresy just as there are to-day. One may readily admit too that the general trend of British theology has received a new orientation in recent years ; but this fact should be very carefully stated. The kind of Liberalism dominant in Germany was never generally followed in this country. The position in the U.S.A. would require separate treatment. Here we are concerned with the British Isles and in the sequel the word ' liberal ' will be used in the sense determined by Loofs ; this appears to be the general interpretation to-day when any description is given, which is not always the case. The main points usually emphasized are the reduction of Christ to a human teacher, the Bible as a human production rather than Divine revelation, disbelief in miracle, and the presentation of Christianity as a message of moral ideals.

When towards the end of last century James Hastings planned his great *Dictionary of the Bible* he selected a band of Biblical scholars and theologians who were generally speaking representative of the best and sanest British scholarship of the time. Here we have a company of Christian scholars who can tell us what was generally believed and taught in this country at the turn of the century. The names include J. H. Bernard, A. S. Peake, A. Plummer, James Denney, Armitage Robinson and many others who were certainly not liberals. Some contributors were obviously chosen because they were experts in some special field ; thus one or two Jews wrote on the Synagogue and the Talmud. J. Drummond the Unitarian wrote on Philo. But the prevailing theological temper of the whole work was not liberal. For example, in the article on Christology J. Agar Beet, a College tutor, wrote : ' the doctrine of the Son of God embodied in the Nicene Creed . . . is to-day the deep conviction of both Anglicans and Nonconformists in England ' (written in 1898—when Liberalism is said to have been rife !).

A. S. Peake may be taken as a representative scholar of this period ; he was an authority on both the Old Testament and the New Testament and wrote valuable commentaries on several books of the Bible. He was moreover editor of one of the first one-volume commentaries which sought to make generally available the new position of critical research, though he confessed that he was only faintly interested in criticism as such. His book *Christianity : Its Nature and its Truth* came out in 1908, and it was so widely read that for some time a new edition was called for monthly. Let us see if it is liberal ; does it reduce Christ to a human teacher and present an anti-supernatural version of Christianity ? We find the very reverse. The chapter on Miracles says that a non-miraculous Christianity cannot stand the test either of criticism or experience (p. 176). Chapter xi. gives a balanced discussion of the Virgin Birth story and concludes that ' its origin is most easily explained if it embodied a fact '. [1]

The next chapter on the Resurrection of Jesus dismisses the vision theory and insists on the empty tomb. The next is on the Divinity of Christ. Another is on the Trinity. For the ground which it covers, this may be described as in the main a work of orthodox traditional theology. Peake, who said so clearly that the crown of thorns was placed ' on the head of Deity itself ', was a devout Christian believer, a Methodist layman who took a leading part in the practical affairs of the Church. He was a great lover of Jeremiah and Paul. In fact in his last illness he said, ' At last I shall meet Jeremiah '.

Another honoured and representative figure was H. R. Mackintosh, whose great book *The Person of Jesus Christ* was published in 1912 and repeatedly re-printed. In this he decisively condemned the German liberals who were advocating a return to the religion of Jesus as distinct from the religion about Jesus. But this standard work is too well known to need any characterization.

For a representative figure in the Church of

1 ' We are speaking ', says Peake, ' of one whom we regard as the Son of God, and whose earthly career closed with the still more stupendous miracle of the Resurrection. We are speaking of the central Figure of all History. Approaching the story along these lines, we may feel that in a person so supernatural the Virgin-birth was natural ' (p. 190).

England we may turn to Bishop Gore. Like Peake he edited a one-volume commentary with the same aim of making the results of Biblical criticism and study available to the general reader. His literary labours were spread over a long period; for he edited *Lux Mundi* in 1889 and was still writing valuable books forty years later. He tells us that as a student in the 1870's he was convinced of the truth of the main critical theories about the Old Testament and was also clear that they were compatible with orthodox faith. This remained his standpoint to the end of his life. Though many would disagree with his High Church principles, in his Biblical position he was representative of a vast number in all the churches. His wide influence and large following are another sign of the absurdity of calling these forty years the liberal period. No one who has read his Bampton Lectures on the Incarnation, his *Dissertations* on the same theme or his much later *Belief in Christ* would dream of calling him a liberal.

It would, of course, be possible to find liberals in British Christianity, but they were hardly representative—R. J. Campbell among the Congregationalists, for instance, whose New Theology provoked tremendous opposition. He himself later withdrew from his position and returned to orthodoxy through the influence of Gore, and became an Anglican canon. The position among the Congregationalists was somewhat exceptional, if we may judge by Nathaniel Micklem's recent autobiography; their method of church government was less centralized and allowed for greater deviations of doctrine. But even here the liberals were not the dominant group and there were many sound men like J. V. Bartlett and A. E. Garvie.

Similarly there were exceptions among the Anglicans. Kirsopp Lake was a clergyman of the Church of England though later he went to the U.S.A. and spent the latter part of his life there. He finally ceased to believe in a personal God, regarding the Divine rather as the Ground of Values. It would be absurd to regard him as representative, as far as his theological views are concerned.

As for the complexion of the preaching in this period, we have abundant evidence. No one could call Alexander Whyte a liberal, or J. D. Jones or J. H. Jowett. Alexander Maclaren's thirty-two volumes of *Expositions of Holy Scripture* [1904–10] were read and studied by thousands of preachers and it would be difficult to trace a whiff of Harnack on a single page (cf. too *The Expositor's Bible*).

It may be asked, How has this situation come about, in which men are credited with beliefs they explicitly opposed? The answer, I think, is as follows. Many German Biblical scholars were rationalists who regarded the Scriptures as human productions and Jesus as a human teacher. (Not all of them by any means—there were men like Delitzsch for example.) In Britain the position was different; and the majority of those who sponsored the new critical views were sincere believers in the Christian faith. When, however, Barth raised a standard against the Continental Liberalism, his brave and uncompromising words were wrongly transferred to the British scene. which was so different and where the rebuke did not generally apply.

Combativeness has its attractions; and so British writers eagerly took up Barth's ringing battle cries and made an onslaught on so-called liberals in their own land and the process still continues. It is curious that British scholars, who have generally shown a fine balance and sanity, and have avoided Continental extremes, should be castigated with Barth's weapons. One is reminded of the oppressive English laws against the working classes in the years which followed the French Revolution; it was said at that time: 'Because Frenchmen have abused their liberties, Englishmen are robbed of theirs'.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Six and Out

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Hear now, O house of Israel; Is not my way equal? are not your ways unequal'.—Ezk 18^{25}.

I don't know whether you would say it is fair or not, but there it is. At a school I know, they have a field right behind the main building. You can play cricket, or pitch a ball about to your heart's content during the break and dinner-hour. But if one goes through a window, you're for it. Report to the master whose form-room it is, report to the school secretary, fill in a form, and pay up your five-and-sixpence before twenty-four hours are out, or else. . . . !

But in the self-same school, you can be playing cricket on the self-same field, and quite a different set of rules may apply. If you happen to be playing for the school eleven against some

opponents, and you are lucky enough to open your shoulders to one on the leg side, and hook it boldly out of the ground, so that it goes smashing through one of the very same form-room windows, there will be a mighty roar of applause. And, believe it or not, the time-honoured tradition is that you will be carried shoulder-high from the field. It won't cost you a penny ; and you needn't even report the damage. It's quite all right because you are playing for the school.

So it should be, in circumstances like that. We can put up with two different sets of rules in a case like that. But there are many other circumstances in which some people want to have two sets of rules when only one is valid. See what I mean.

You would never think of arming yourself with a sawn-off rifle, covering your face with a stocking, pulling your peaked cap down over your face, and going into the local post-office and saying, ' Stick 'em up ' before you ransacked the till. That would be stealing what did not belong to you. But I wonder. . . . If you were stuck over a sentence in your French translation and old Pongo Parker (who is a genius at the blessed stuff) happened to be out of the prep. room, would you stoop to take a quick squint inside his exercise book, just to see what he had made it ? That would be one rule for the two thousand pounds, but another for the *deux petits mots*.

I have known boys who govern the language they use by one set of rules when they are at home with their parents to hear, but by quite a different set when they are hob-nobbing in the school yard. If anyone happens to mention that such cuss-words are not drawing-room quality, they say, ' But this is different '. It isn't different at all. If it's wrong to use them in one place, it is wrong to use them in another.

And I have known boys who have drilled themselves into the proper habit of spending the last five minutes of every day in quiet prayer with the Father of us all : they would never think of turning in without that splendid, enriching time at the end of the day. But the custom has sometimes been quite forgotten when they have gone away to camp and have had to share a tent with five others. ' Oh ', they say sometimes, ' but camp is different '. It isn't, you know. To keep faith with God is a prime responsibility, whether at home or at camp.

Perhaps you have seen the name of ' Laing ' on big yellow boards where great public works are taking place, like the London–Yorkshire motor-way in the Midlands. That firm was built up by a grand Christian gentleman, who believed that he should take the rules of his religion as the rules of his business. There is a book about him, in which I read how as a boy he was watching an old foreman mason, Bob Franklin, at work. The old man worked with wonderful care, and John Laing asked him why he was fussing over a sixteenth of an inch on a stone which was going to be placed a hundred feet above ground. The old mason said : ' If I were to get slovenly over my work at a hundred feet, I might get into a slovenly way altogether. It's best to do everything right.'

Old Bob had got something there. It's God's plan too. That is what our text is saying.

Too Near to See

By the Reverend L. J. Moon, M.A., B.D., Ilford

' Speak, Lord : for thy servant heareth '.—1 S 3^{9}.

I was talking the other day in my study to two different people and I could not see either of them. That was not because it was dark for it was day-time, nor because I could not see. One of them was too near and the other was too far away.

As I was talking to the One a bell rang, and I picked up the telephone receiver and heard someone mention my name and immediately recognized his voice. Without his saying who he was I said, ' Oh, it's good to hear your voice. How are you ? ' Even if I hadn't immediately recognized the voice I should soon have known who it was without him telling me, because of the way he spoke and the things he said. I was indeed more sure who it was, though I could not see him and he was many miles away, than I am sometimes of somebody across the road whom I ought to know but don't immediately recognize.

Now, when we had finished talking I put down the telephone receiver and after a moment I started to talk to the Other Person who was too near to see. To speak to Him I just bowed my head, both talking and listening. I was talking to God, who is ' nearer to us than breathing, closer than hands or feet '. He is too near to see, and yet we can speak to Him and He speaks to us. We can tell Him of things we need, and of our thankfulness for His gifts. He speaks to us too, and we know it's He because of what He says and how He says it. Sometimes He speaks by a small voice within, which nobody else can hear. He says, maybe, ' You mustn't do that ' or ' Run that errand for your mummy '. And when He speaks like that we can't answer Him back, but know that we ought to obey.

Sometimes, too, when we take this book (the Bible) and read it carefully and pray about it, He speaks to us from it, and we know who it is who is speaking even though we cannot see Him, and even though nobody else can hear.

Many years ago there was a lad who was living away from home, and one night he was awakened by somebody calling him by name. But there was nobody in the room. The boy thought it was the old priest in another room. But it wasn't. It was Somebody too near to see, and Samuel learned from the old priest to listen and to say, 'Speak, Lord; for thy servant heareth'.

God also wants to speak to you and with you. In prayer and in your Bible reading He will speak, and perhaps call you to do some special work, and certainly to serve Him all your days. And if you answer 'yes' when He speaks and calls, then you, like many others, will be able to say and sing, 'He walks with me and talks with me along life's narrow way. . . . He lives within my heart'.

The Christian Year

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Harvest Thanksgiving

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D., TH.M., GLASGOW

'Blessed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us with benefits, even the God of our salvation'—Ps 68[19].

Sometimes a preacher has to wrestle with a text to extract its meaning. This one does not appear to be like that. What it has to say seems to lie right on the surface. It tells of the lavish goodness of God, hints at that extravagant profusion, of which the gifts at Harvest Festival are a symbol. Here before us is proof of the Divine liberality in the range and variety of shapes and tastes and perfumes and colours of the fruits and flowers, which even our dour soil yields. Not long ago I took a very old lady a run into the country on a fine day and, after a time, with a Scottish gift for under-statement, she remarked, 'Do you ken? It's no' a bad old world.' And neither it is.

Do you remember Borrow? 'There's night and day, brother, both sweet things; sun, moon and stars, brother, all sweet things; there's likewise the wind on the heath. Life is very sweet, brother.' And it is meet, right and our bounden duty that we should give thanks for it.

Bless, O my soul, the Lord thy God,
and not forgetful be
Of all his gracious benefits
He hath bestow'd on thee.

There, or almost there, this sermon might have ended, had I not looked up a commentary, one of the books written by learned men about the Bible. There I found that this is one of the texts with which the translators of the Authorised Version have not been so successful. The Hebrew of the original means not so much 'Blessed be God who daily loadeth us with benefits' as 'Blessed be God who daily loadeth Himself with our burdens'. At first a little crestfallen, I later came to see that the new translation contained a truth even more wonderful than the old. It is not only that God is willing to take over the burden of the tasks and problems that daily confront us. It is that He has already done so in some sort, so that all our anxieties are needless.

Take, for example, our constant preoccupation with making ends meet, with providing food and clothing and shelter for ourselves and our dependants. Of course we must work for our daily bread but we need not be anxious. God has made provision for our needs—wonderful and complete provision. Consider the facts. In the city of Glasgow alone one million pint bottles of milk were left on doorsteps this very morning. Half-a-million housewives got up to take them in and proceeded to crack, cook and serve at least a million eggs and two or three million cups of tea or coffee. At this very moment two hundred and fifty thousand pounds of meat and a corresponding quantity of potatoes are being cooked to satisfy the hunger of a million-and-a-quarter diners. This is what happens in only one city! And all of this intricate, marvellously efficient system of production, distribution and preparation has to go on day after day wherever men live.

Even at that, the burden of providing food is perhaps the simplest problem of those that mankind faces. Think of the number of nurses who sat up with sick people last night, of the number of mothers hearkening for their baby's cry, or of the millions of sleepless folk. Look up at any block of flats. All through the night one or two lights burn. Behind the curtain some drama of life or death is being played out, some heart is rejoicing or sorrowing. Think of the burden of the statesman in these days and of the journalist, of the scientist and the soldier. Think of your own pressing problem of the moment.

The plain lesson of our text is that no man need bear his burden alone. God, already aware of our burdens and concerned, is willing to bear them for us, to take over all responsibility, if only we yield ourselves to His obedience. The word that is used for God in the text is The Lord. That is the name which speaks of God's kingship, of His dignity and power. It visualizes God as One who has dominion, absolute authority over the whole universe. It is this One—the Lord God—who stoops to bear our daily burdens. He, who healeth the broken in heart, is the same as He that telleth the number of the stars. This our Lord taught by a very beautiful acted parable. So 'Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God . . . took a towel, and girded

himself . . . and began to wash the disciples' feet'. The management of the universe is not beyond God, but the meanest task is not beneath Him.

If your life, like mine, is mostly filled with satisfying other peoples' needs then there is wondrous cheer here for us. If our days are concerned in feeding others or teaching them; in healing them or serving them; if our souls often seem likely to be frittered away in detail and fretted with evanescent trifles, then let us not try to bear our burdens alone. Let us take them to God, who is quite accustomed to concerning Himself with them. He who notes the fall of the sparrow and counts the hairs of our head will not look upon our burdens as beneath His notice or beyond His power. Blessed be the Lord who beareth our burdens.

Just one word more—notice that our text really says, 'Blessed be the Lord who *daily* beareth our burdens'. Our God is a *Daily* God—not one for Sundays only. It is good to see bread and butter among the harvest gifts. They should come into the House of God once in a while, that we may learn to take God back to the bread and butter of our daily lives. Churches are open every day in many places. That is a good thing, but not if it gives the impression that God lives in church. He is to be found just as surely at the sink or by the forge, in the shop or the garden, in the field or the mill. The term 'the Lord's Day' for Sunday can give rise to misunderstanding. Every day is the Lord's Day. We must not give God a new commandment 'One Day shalt thou labour and do all Thy work for the other six belong to us. About these Thou shalt not have any say.' If we treat God thus, we have not seen Him as He really is, as He is in Christ. Once we know Him in Christ we shall no longer want to keep Him out of our daily lives, nor hesitate to trust Him with our daily concerns.

The Lord God who in Christ has borne our sins, in His own body, on the tree, will make light of our lesser burdens, howsoever grievous they may appear to us to be. 'He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?' Cast thy burden whatever it may be upon the Lord and He shall sustain thee. The heavier the load, the more readily He will accept it. If you feel that to be a Christian is a meritorious thing, a hard job to be done, an extra burden to be borne along with the rest, you have the wrong idea of it. You have not even begun to believe your faith, far less to live it, till day by day you can say, 'Blessed be the Lord who daily beareth our burdens'.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Better all the Way

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL J. ITHEL JONES, M.A. B.D., THE SOUTH WALES BAPTIST COLLEGE, CARDIFF

'. . . thou hast kept the good wine until now'.—Jn 2^{10}.

That puzzled the master of ceremonies not a little. It was all wrong. The order was normally good wine first and then, when they got beyond it, any old thing would do.

Some of the commentators are worried. Their researches into drinking customs have revealed the opposite. A learned German theological journal of 1931 carried an article of nine pages proving that in New Testament times the good wine always was served last. Of course the writer of this Gospel is not concerned with drinking customs really. He is talking about something else. He does so all the way through. Like many an important letter, we have to read in between the lines in this Gospel. When the master of ceremonies said, 'Every man putteth forth the good wine first', the Evangelist could see the implication that, in the experience of this world, the longer a thing is enjoyed the less pleasant it tends to become. There is a tendency for feasts to deteriorate and for pleasures to pall.

We don't lose anything by facing this fact. When we do a little introspection, we notice the thing happening. Things don't fire us in quite the same way as they used to. We pick up a book that thrilled us years ago and wonder whatever we saw in it. We re-visit an entertainment which used to make us excited, and we find ourselves bored. What we are discovering is that the inspiration of these things is soon exhausted. They give the best wine first, and then that which is worse.

We claim that in Christ that process is reversed. The wine becomes better as the feast goes on, and the very best is reserved till the end.

Is that true? It is, surely. *It is true of Christ's ministry in His Church.* As time goes on, that ministry becomes more and more remarkable. We have spoken of the ministry of Christ as if its most remarkable phase was its earliest—during the earthly life of our Lord, or at least in the life of the Early Church. That is quite wrong. As Christ's ministry has proceeded it has become more remarkable not less. For example, one of the very remarkable features of the New Testament is Christ's mastery over disease. Of course, there are some people who see nothing miraculous, in the strict sense, in this at all. It can be explained, they say, in the light of modern

knowledge, along natural lines. These people lack a sense of proportion. In ten years time, the newspapers may carry the headlines of a flight to the moon. But, if we discovered an authentic story of such a thing having happened in 1410, we would call that a ' miracle '. Whatever be the exact connotation of the word ' miraculous ', that a Galilean peasant two thousand years ago, without any modern medical knowledge, could effect these cures is certainly remarkable.

Even so, we have to realize, as William Temple pointed out, that Christ's ministry was considerably confined. The fact and the manner of His incarnation set limitations upon Him. He worked in a small unimportant country. When, however, we look out at His influence to-day, the picture is vastly different. There are now centres of healing all over the earth, centres sponsored and run by the Christian Church. And this is far greater than the healing of hundreds of people in Palestine. Christ is no longer straitened and limited by our mortal state. His works are diffused throughout the world. Of every stage of His ministry it can be said, 'Thou hast kept the best until now '.

But the message I particularly want to bring to you now is that *it is true within the compass of the Christian's own life.* Those who have been faithful to Him have confessed at each stage of their Christian experience, ' Thou hast kept the good wine until now '.

I am always impressed by the excitement of a young Christian. They are days of seeing visions and dreaming dreams. It is the rapture of first love. There is nothing between. Christ is wonderful. His glory is all in all.

But, someone may say, is that not a case of the best wine coming first ? The early rapture goes. Is there anything that quite takes its place ? Some would say that there is not. We recall William Cowper's hymn, ' O for a closer walk with God '. He complains :

Where is the blessedness I knew
When first I saw the Lord ?
Where is the soul-refreshing view
Of Jesus and His word ?

What peaceful hours I once enjoyed !
How sweet their memory still !

Well, let us be quite clear about this : William Cowper's hymn, lovely poetry though it be, is not a picture of true Christian experience. It is the picture of one who has fallen away and is crying desperately to come back. He is not a reliable witness of what happens in the true progress of the Christian life. Of course, we can't maintain the ecstasy and the excitement of the early days. Even our love for Christ is transformed. But the transformation is into something deeper and more real. When young couples come to me to be married, I warn them that even their love will change its form. But, even when we light a fire, it is in the early stages of the burning of the sticks that the fuss and spitting and excitement of the fire are evident. It is when the fire settles down to a silent warm glow that it radiates its proper heat. We are aware of the perils of moving into middle age ; the danger of losing idealism. We see it on all hands. There is the famous epitaph in a Paris graveyard. ' He was born a man, and died a grocer.' That happens to so many. We start out resolved to live and then become content with making a living. And this spells the death of the soul.

A Christ who can keep a man from this death is a wonderful Saviour indeed. For this is a greater feat than firing the love and the imagination of the young in their teens. And He has done it. There are men and women in our congregations whose cup of life is fuller than ever it was because Christ has kept on filling it up to the brim.

' Every man puts forth good wine first, and then that which is worse ', but, of Christ we can say, ' He has kept the good wine until now '. Don't cry with Cowper, ' Where is the blessedness I knew ? ' I do not like Sankey hymns. But, over against Cowper, I would commend the verse,

He is not a disappointment
Jesus is far more to me
Than in all my glorious day-dreams
I imagined He could be
And the more I get to know Him
So the more I find Him true
And the more I long that others
Should be brought to know Him, too.

And what of that which is yet to be ? Old age brings grave perils of spirit. There is increasing physical weakness. Worst of all, there is the knowledge that the sighing sound in our ears is not the breeze rustling the trees in the spring but the lapping of the waves on Jordan's verge. This could cause misgiving and even terror. And a Christ who can cause a man's anxious fears to subside when he treads the verge of Jordan is great indeed. Even at that time He fills the heart with a new wonder and shows us new horizons. If, at that stage, you ask when Christ means most to a man, whether in his teens or in his middle years or in his late eighties, there is no question about the answer. He keeps the best wine until the end. The wonder of His love is not only inexhaustible, it is ever increasing.

One day we shall see Him face to face. And who can tell the rapture of that moment ? To see Him

as He is! In that day, surely, the words of the master of ceremonies to the bridegroom will find their way from our hearts to our lips. 'Thou hast kept the good wine until now.'

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

'The Resurrection of the Body'—Does it Make Sense? [1]

'But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?'—1 Co 15^{35}).

When scornful unbelievers want to prove the absurdity of the Christian faith and the feeble-mindedness or hypocrisy of those who profess it, they sometimes ask us to picture a congregation reciting the creed—'I believe in . . . the resurrection of the body. . . .' 'And that', they snort contemptuously, 'in the twentieth century!'

Well, the phrase is firmly embedded in the earliest creed of the Church and Christians have been repeating it for centuries. There is little doubt that it meant what it said—that these bodies of flesh and blood would one day rise from their graves. What about the people who repeat it now?

There is no doubt that some people, though a small minority, do still believe quite literally in the resurrection of the body. I remember that some years ago a lot of ancient bones were discovered near an East Anglican town. They were collected and taken to the local museum where they became thoroughly mixed up, as they were when I saw them. The museum authorities received a rebuke from some local residents who said, 'We would not care to be in your place on the Last Day when the owners of those bones ask you, "Where is my arm?" or "What have you done with my leg?"'.

Well, we can agree, whatever those who framed the Apostles' Creed meant by the phrase, 'the resurrection of the body', that we cannot say it and mean it literally. But it does not therefore follow that we cannot say it without any meaning at all. We shall always be wise to ask what was the ultimate significance of a phrase, what it was really getting at, lest we reject, with an outworn form of words, an idea which will never be outworn.

[1] *Facing Life and Death: A Volume in Commemoration of the late Leslie J. Tizard*, ed. Harry Guntrip, B.D., Ph.D. (Allen & Unwin). The sermon has been shortened. The volume was our Entre Nous feature last month.

Now, the conception of the resurrection of the body conserves at least two important truths:

The identity of the individual in the future life.

Jesus Himself, when He spoke about the after-life, always implied that the soul would have some sort of body. But He did not mean that the body of flesh and blood would be raised up, for when the Sadducees put to Him their trick question about the seven brothers who, one after another, married the same woman, He said they were wide of the mark because the physical conditions of this life did not apply in the other world. (The question as to whether the physical body of Jesus Himself was raised is irrelevant here because, in any case, it took place almost at once and not after the body had disintegrated.)

Paul has a great deal to say about the resurrection body. But he certainly did not mean that our physical frames live on in another world. Dr. Micklem points out that we must notice a difference in Paul's usage between 'flesh' and 'body'. 'St. Paul asserts that our "bodies" shall be "changed"; he also asserts that "flesh and blood" shall not inherit the Kingdom. By "body" he means not something physical, but rather a principle of identity. For instance, I bear on my body a scar made by a surgeon's knife some thirty years and more ago. I have been told that during this thirty years all the physical particles of my body have changed, so that practically nothing remains of that flesh which the surgeon cut; but the scar remains. There is a non-physical principle of identity in the human body (or, to take another example, in a river) which makes it the same body (or river) though it be physically in a state of constant flux. St. Paul tells us that the body, which is our principle of identity, and which now is suited to our earthly environment, shall one day be suited to our heavenly environment'.

It seems to me that Paul has opened up to us a sense in which we can say, 'I believe in the resurrection of the body', and in which we *must* believe it if we are to make sense of life.

For—let me say it again—the doctrine of the resurrection of the body means that the individual continues to exist *as an individual.*

There are two reasons why this must be so if this is a moral universe.

(1) Justice requires it. Paul states a demand of the moral conscience when he says that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. There is no need to picture an actual judgment scene on the model of an earthly court. The point is that the individual carries his moral responsibility with him into the other world. You may think of a sentence of punishment or

reward passed on him by a perfectly holy Judge, or you may think of the consequences of his earthly life continuing to work themselves out. Our moral sense demands this continuity.

(2) There are in every soul vast unrealized possibilities. That, in part, accounts for the tragic nature of our human existence. We feel it acutely when the young die with their personalities undeveloped, but having shown signs of the rich potentialities within them. But we may feel it, too, when older men and women, full of experience and of the graces and breadth of sympathy which only the years can give, are at last hampered by the limitations of bodily weakness. Have you never felt, when such men and women pass on that their very maturity has given glimpses of unimaginable depths of personality yet to be realized? God created those potentialities. He would be defeated if death ended all. But He would only be a little less defeated if individuals were absorbed into some sea of Being, their identity lost, the full stature of their manhood and womanhood never seen.

The possibility of recognition in the future life.

One of our deepest human longings is to know that we shall meet and recognize our loved ones in another world. We do not believe that the personal relationship is broken for ever. That does not mean—or ought not to mean—that we believe we shall meet our loved ones on the other side either in their physical body, or in some ethereal replica of it as we knew it in the moment of death. Indeed, if the bodies of our loved ones were ravaged by disease we try to remember them, not as they died, but as we knew them in the years before. No, it means that we shall meet them in some form which preserves their identity, and which enables us to have a spiritual relationship with them.

What can we say about the nature of this 'resurrection body'? Paul uses the analogy of a seed and the plant which springs from it. The body which is sown at birth, he says, is not the body which is ours at the resurrection. The seed, the vital germ, is placed in the ground, and as it rises into the upper air it alters its form. Only, as Dr. Moffatt points out, Paul does not say that it alters; he makes God, as usual, the sovereign giver of the new form. So God gives to man a *spiritual* body.

Theologians have speculated a good deal as to the nature of this spiritual body. It will always, I suspect, remain a subject for speculation. I doubt whether science or psychical research will ever give us a final answer.

It may be material in some sense, as Paul certainly thought, though it will not be material in the same way as our present bodies. We naturally think of a material thing as hard and solid, but the real nature of matter is still a mystery. Scientists now talk about matter in terms of energy. Perhaps the hard, ponderable thing that most of us understand by matter is not the only form, and certainly the relation of matter and spirit is an unsolved puzzle.

There is, it seems to me, only one thing of which we can be quite sure. The spiritual body, whatever its composition, will express the personality. To some extent even our physical bodies do that already. Artists and photographers tell us, for example, that character is seen in the face. And it may well be that by our thoughts, words and deeds even in this life we are building the spiritual bodies in which our souls will be clothed in the life to come. The possibility—which is not unreasonable—that it may be so, is enough to invest all our present thoughts and actions with an eternal significance.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Newer Vainglory

BY CAPTAIN THE REVEREND J. A. DAVIDSON, B.A., B.D., FORT CHURCHILL, MANITOBA

'Two men went up into the temple to pray . . .'—Lk 18^{10}.

You can readily imagine how the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican must have shaken the complacent, self-righteous people to whom it was addressed. This Pharisee, a member of the spiritual upper-crust of Judaism, is one of those miserable people who make a fetish of formal correctness in religion. His soul is warped by what H. G. Wells called 'the bargaining righteousness of formal religion'. He has become for us a symbol of all that is mean and narrow and snobbish in religion.

The publican is one of those renegade Jews who collect customs duties for the Roman rulers of the land under a corrupt system of collection. He is despised by his countrymen as a petty racketeer who has sold out to the heathen overlords. It is inconceivable that a publican should be a hero of a Jewish religious story—but Jesus makes this one the hero.

Jesus is not concerned in this Parable primarily to criticize the religion of the Pharisees as such. His intention, rather, is to show forth in the person of this Pharisee the state of mind and heart that makes real prayer impossible. To picture a Pharisee, an expert in formal piety, praying in vain is to sharpen the emphasis. And to sharpen the emphasis further Jesus took a member of the most despised class of Jew and used him to show that any one can be reconciled to God through humble confession.

And before we become too incensed at the hypocrisy and pious insolence of the Pharisee let us pause and examine the real nature of his attitude. The Pharisees and people like them have no monopoly in that attitude: that attitude is rather common in our society. Of course, not many are afflicted with Pharisaism to-day: we may pin the tag 'Pharisee' on a few unpleasant people of rather harsh and snobbish piety, but most of us do not display the habits of the Pharisee. But can we claim that we are free of the complacency and the self-satisfaction and the self-assurance that made the Pharisee act as he did? Is not one of our more fashionable vices a sort of inverted Pharisaism, an upside-down Pharisaism?

This upside-down Pharisaism is pictured in a short poem—*The Newer Vainglory*—by Alice Meynell; and in it she gives a 'reverse twist' to the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. In the first two stanzas she tells that two men went up to pray: one of them gives thanks that he claps not his own humble breast but other ruffians' backs—and he suggests that he himself is really a bit of a gay dog. And in the final stanza he sums up in this way:

'For I am tolerant, generous, keep no rules,
And the age honours me.
Thank God, I am not as these rigid fools,
Even as this Pharisee.'

Yes, this is 'the newer vainglory'. This is the form of hypocrisy and pettiness of soul that is honoured in our age. The point is made in a different way by John Baillie in one of his books. He tells the story he heard in New York of a well-meaning Sunday School teacher who concluded a lesson on the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican by saying sweetly, 'And now, children, let us thank God that we are not like this Pharisee'. And have not most of us at least a touch of this upside-down Pharisaism? Are we not tempted, when we think about this Parable to thank God that we are not as that Pharisee—stuffy, narrow-minded, self-righteous?

For I am tolerant, generous, keep no rules,
And the age honours me.

That comes right out of the heart of modern society.

We must distinguish between tolerance which is a necessary pillar supporting democracy and what can fairly be called 'petty tolerance'. Petty tolerance consists in that wearing away of standards and values which results in a vague, sentimental approval of almost anything anyone does—providing, of course, that he is not intolerant about it. Tolerance, the petty variety, is indeed very fashionable nowadays. And we don't seem to care very much that decency and moral integrity can dissolve in it. Ogden Nash tells about this petty tolerance in one of his light verses:

Sometimes with secret pride I sigh
To think how tolerant am I;
Then wonder which is really mine:
Tolerance, or a rubber spine?

Make no mistake about this: inverted Pharisaism just as effectively warps the soul and keeps it from fellowship with God as does the standard brand, for it is essentially the same thing. Jesus addressed the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican to 'those which trusted in themselves', to those who were confident in their own righteousness, to those who were certain of their own *rightness*. And is not this a rather conspicuous characteristic of modern man. Is it unfair to suggest that all of us have at least a touch of self-righteousness in our nature? To-day the upside-down Pharisee is crowding his old-fashioned brother rather badly. The bright, smooth, modern sophisticate, when he tells us with a worldly smile of his odious little immoralities, is every bit as self-righteous as the ancient Pharisee. The petty crook—and he is legion nowadays—shows self-righteousness as he tolerantly excuses his petty crookedness and feels quite superior to the simple, honest people who don't play his little games.

In the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican Jesus showed that self-righteousness separates us from God. And He proclaimed that humility is the key to prayer and the key to the whole life of faith. In challenging those 'which trusted in themselves' He challenges all of us.

The publican prayed, 'God be merciful to me a sinner'. And Jesus said, 'I tell you, he went home accepted by God' (Lk 18^{14} [Moffatt]).

Entre Nous

Voyage of Exploration

The man who spends a fortnight in a country and who then comes home and writes a book about it, has always been a standing literary jest. But what are we to say of a man who visits seven countries—Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela—between 26th June and 29th August 1957, and who then writes a book about them all? That is what the Rev. E. H. Robertson has done in his book *To-morrow is a Holiday* (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net). Mr. Robertson was invited by the United Bible Societies to visit Latin America in order to learn something of church life there, and in particular to pursue his studies on the place and use of the Bible. The title of the book is taken from a saying by the President of Brazil: 'Brazil is the country of to-morrow. Yes. But to-morrow is a holiday.'

The situation for the Protestant Church in Latin America does not differ so very much from the situation of the Christian Church in the Roman Empire, and therein lies the fascination of this book. The material of the book consists of letters sent by Mr. Robertson from Latin America to his secretary in Geneva during his tour; and, therefore, the book is not a book of memories but of immediate impressions.

We find that the minister has often another profession than the ministry, just as a Jewish Rabbi had. In Brazil Mr. Robertson met a Presbyterian minister who is also an architect and who designed the Baptist Seminary and the Good Will House. 'We found him sitting in the midst of a growing structure, every bit an architect, engineer, works manager and minister rolled into one.' There is little danger of a ministry like that becoming remote from the people and from everyday life.

We find a poverty of which the Western world knows very little. 'One little girl of six was in town with a young American missionary who, as part of the conversation and preliminary to buying something, said, "I'm hungry". The little girl answered grimly, "I can stand hunger". Or there was the story of the mother who said, "I have had eleven children, but, thank God, only five lived"'. We find that in Chile fewer than sixty-one out of ten thousand children find an elementary education. And yet in that same country the Protestant community has grown from sixty thousand to three hundred thousand and is still growing.

The missionary Protestant work that is being done must be very like work in the Early Church. In Brazil there is a school where girls are trained for full-time evangelization work, especially work amidst children. 'You just go to a village, gather a few children and begin teaching them. Soon you have a full congregation and you can handle a regular Sunday School without any premises; just under a tree.' A Methodist circuit leader tells how the Church grows: 'First a layman would gather some neighbours for a Bible study group. Then as they grew in number they would rent a room and use it for meetings. In this room a Sunday School would be held and later they became a Church with a lay pastor.'

Obviously in a situation like that the individual Christian will be the best advertisement for Christianity. 'They say that, particularly in the poorer quarters, you can tell a Protestant home by its cleanness and brightness.' One man told how he was converted by a building workman who was working in his house. 'The best evangelists are good workmen who by the quality of their work encourage the question, What makes you different?' There, indeed, is a Christian challenge for us.

Even the persecution of the Early Church is re-enacted. In Colombia Mr. Robertson met William Easton who had been there since 1949. The Roman Catholics took every opportunity there to instigate persecution and to obliterate the Protestant Church. William Easton was arrested at a service for young people. For four hours those who attended were maltreated by thugs in the military barracks. 'They had to run round the courtyard and be beaten as they ran; they were dumped in a tank of cold water; they were forced to drink from the sewers. Easton had to sing a hymn, and be knocked down at the end of each verse. He had to preach and be beaten at intervals. Later they were stripped and had to go through the whole process again. In that condition they had to roll on the gravel, crawl under barbed wire in the dark, roll in burning chaff, and were stood up to be shot. Easton does not know what happened then. He simply said, encouraging the boys: "Remember, whatever happens, we are not in the hands of that man with a gun. We are in the hands of God."' The great days of the Christian heroes are not yet past.

Mr. Robertson has succeeded in writing a book which is enlightening, awakening, uplifting, challenging, and sometimes shaming. It is the kind of book which ought to bring a man first to his knees in prayer, and then to his feet in action.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.